

AMERICAN OPINION

*In this number
we emphasize:*

**IF YOU
WANT IT STRAIGHT...**

LILLY LIBRARY
WABASH COLLEGE

AN INFORMAL REVIEW

Volume III Number 2

FEBRUARY 1960

50¢

AMERICAN OPINION

Editor

ROBERT WELCH

Associate Editors

HUBERT KREGELOH

J. B. MATTHEWS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

HANS SENNHOLZ

Contributing Editors

COLM BROGAN

MEDFORD EVANS

RODNEY GILBERT

EDWIN McDOWELL

ELIZABETH WILSON

Editorial

Advisory Committee

The following group of distinguished Americans give the editor comments and advice which are helpful in determining the editorial policy, contents, and opinions of this magazine. But no responsibility can be attributed to any members of this Committee for any specific articles, items, or conclusions which appear in these pages.

GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG, JR.

JOHN U. BARR

K. G. BENTSON

LAURENCE E. BUNKER

F. GANO CHANCE

JAMES L. COKER

KENNETH COLEGROVE

MARTIN J. CONDON, III

ROBERT B. DRESSER

CHARLES EDISON

WM. J. GREDE

FRANK E. HOLMAN

B. E. HUTCHINSON

ALFRED KOHLBERG

J. BRACKEN LEE

CLARENCE MANION

FRANK E. MASLAND, JR.

N. FLOYD MCGOWIN

W. L. MCGRATH

W. B. MCMILLAN

ADOLPHE MENJOU

LUDWIG VON MISES

COLA G. PARKER

J. HOWARD PEW

J. NELSON SHEPHERD

ROBERT W. STODDARD

ERNEST G. SWIGERT

A. C. WEDEMEYER

W. H. WILBUR

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON

CONTENTS—FEBRUARY, 1960

European Survey	William S. Schamm	1
A Military Officer Looks At Disarmament	Captain Paul R. Schratz, U.S.N.	7
Cartoon	Victor Vashi	10
Our Corrupt Monetary Bloodstream .	Walter E. Spahr	11
If You Want It Straight		17
Confetti		38
A Review Of Reviews	Revilo P. Oliver	39
A Review Of The News		45

January 22, 1960

Dear Reader:

We urge you to spread the alarm: *Stay Away, U. S. A. — The Summit Leads To Disaster.*

As Louis Budenz so brilliantly pointed out and prophesied, years ago, "the cry is peace."

There is already peace, of course, in Estonia and Latvia and Lithuania, and Armenia and Byelorussia, and Georgia and the Ukraine. And not just peace for the dead millions that have been murdered, but peace for the living millions that have been enslaved.

There is already peace in Poland and Hungary; in Albania and Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia; in Romania and Bulgaria and East Germany; and of course in Russia itself. Even such resistance as existed in any of those countries has been provoked into showing itself prematurely — so that it could be destroyed, and a more deadly peace bestowed on the remainder of the population.

Except for a few million Chinese here and there, engaged in desperately suicidal rebellion on behalf of freedom, there is peace on all the mainland of China. There is the same peace in North Korea, and North Vietnam, and Guiana, and Guinea, and Ghana. With guns and bayonets and clubs, and with more refined instruments of terror and of torture where necessary, the henchmen of unspeakable Communist murderers like Achmed Sukarno in Indonesia, Juan Lechin in Bolivia, Karim el-Kassem in Iraq, and Fidel Castro in Cuba are bringing more and more peace to their respective countries.

Peace has many faces. There is the morning peace of the grave, for those who during the night have died of hunger and despair; the evening peace of the slaughter house, when the day's slaughtering is done; and the timeless peace of the escapeless prison, after a hopeless revolt has been subdued. The Communist peace (the Cold Peace to which the Cold War leads) is compounded of all three. And the conspirators now expect, after a few more rounds of fraternizing visits and one or two more summit conferences, to be able to impose that peace on the rest of a rapidly surrendering world.

May God have mercy on the sons of man.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

AMERICAN OPINION—is published eleven months in the year by Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont 78, Massachusetts, U. S. A. Subscription rates are five dollars per year in the United States and Canada; seven dollars elsewhere. Copyright 1960 by Robert Welch, Inc. We use almost no articles except those written to order to fit our specific needs, and can assume no responsibility for the return of unsolicited manuscripts.

EUROPEAN SURVEY

by

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Mailed from Crans-sur-Sierre, Switzerland, January, 2, 1960

EISENHOWER came home to roost and Europe shivers. Here, ten times more and faster than in a United States hypnotized by a monolithic press, does one realize that the President's triumphal journey through four continents indicated the very nadir of American might.

The reckoning began even while Eisenhower was still on his way—in Paris. Readers of the American press must of course believe that the whole trouble, as our metropolitan papers implied, was simply another outbreak of Charles de Gaulle's notorious "difficulties"—his dramatic sense of *grandeur*, his ornery insistence on going it alone, and all the other famous depravities of French nationalism. But NATO's mortal sickness (for that, in two words, is what the recent events in Paris amounted to) was caused, not by French orneriness, but by Eisenhower's policies.

Peace — It's Wonderful . . .

In the first place, though the French Government now speaks more firmly and more audibly than any other NATO member, it was by no means the only government that began to walk out on its NATO obligations. Belgium, Norway, Denmark, and yes, glorious Britain have for many months consistently reduced their manpower and their technical contributions to NATO. And, what's more, logic was entirely on their side.

For, after all, NATO has one and only one *raison d'être*: to combine Western military forces for the sole purpose of holding back an open military attack on one or several NATO members. And to the extent that such an open military Soviet attack becomes unlikely, NATO's rationale as well as its readiness must of necessity shrink.

It will remain one of history's silliest paradoxes that Eisenhower, the man who initiated and first organized NATO, should also have been the one who dismembered it. But exactly this he did; and he did it in Camp David.

Let us listen to a most competent expert on the strategic problems of the world-wide struggle between East and West — to Palmiro Togliatti, the able boss of the Italian Communist Party. This is what he said in Rome on November 21, 1959:

"Eisenhower is one of the great men who brought about the end of tension . . . Through this *détente* between the big powers a large part of the anti-Communist attitude which was at the core of the Cold War must collapse. The Communist Party can only welcome such a development." And then Togliatti went on to demand that Italy's governing parties reconsider their anti-Communist attitudes and "liberate the Italian Communists from the quarantine in which they have remained since 1948." In other words, Togliatti proclaims the "popular front" in Italy,

European Survey

and elsewhere, as the logical outgrowth of the "spirit of Camp David."

Here, in a nutshell, is the case history of NATO's latest and probably mortal spasm. No European people (nor the Americans, either) will endure the considerable hardships of preparedness, if the West's responsible leaders—thus, in the first place, the President of the United States—continue to preach "the end of tension." And, in this case anyway, Eisenhower has not even the excuse that Hagerty had not told him in time. He, Eisenhower, knows from his own experience as NATO chief how unavoidably the slightest illusion about Soviet intentions must weaken European defense efforts. He must remember how in his presence, in December 1957, another Parisian NATO conference almost resulted in NATO's final demise, simply because the ghosts of Geneva were still spooking around. And so, when he started his pilgrimage to the "summit," he must have known what his venture would do to NATO.

Everybody Rides The Bandwagon . . .

Charles de Gaulle is good enough a strategist to foresee likely developments and to salvage at least his own strength from the ruins of the debacle. Like any other competent observer of European events he anticipates an irresistible popular demand for disarmament in the United States and in Western Europe. Even more. That desire is not a matter of anticipation—it has been the great fact of the last two years.

Britain has already reduced its military establishment to the point of no return, where it indisputably can no longer back up its foreign commitments

with military power. West Germany, in spite of the demonstrable good will of Adenauer and Strauss, is badly lagging behind its promised rearmament: It is most improbable that Germany will supply in 1961 the fourteen battle-ready divisions on which NATO's entire planning was based. Charles de Gaulle has no intention to allow France to participate in the forthcoming bankruptcy: When the military structure of NATO visibly collapses, de Gaulle's France at least wants to retain any military power it may by then have been able to achieve. And to that end, the French military forces must not be left under the command of a NATO that has been deprived, by American policies, of its destiny and its every vital purpose.

Diplomatic protocol demanded that things must be formally patched up before Eisenhower finally went home. But nobody was taken in by diplomatic protocol. There is, for all realistic purposes, no NATO in existence: Khrushchev can now perfectly safely proceed on the assumption that the Atlantic military alliance has been dissolved. What remains are the effective forces-in-being still in Europe—a few United States divisions, about six organized West German divisions and, above all, the United States Air Force in Europe capable of carrying nuclear weapons. These are the only three military formations of any meaning to Khrushchev. For the French army is still absorbed in Algeria and the British forces on the Continent are mere tokens, and not quite believable tokens at that.

Now, it is of course entirely possible that even such puny military forces left in Europe will continue to make Khrushchev feel cautious—much the more as he most definitely prefers the

"peaceful" Western surrender to any military adventures. But then again, this may change in a year or two. By then, the United States forces may have been fully withdrawn from the Continent, the Adenauer Government may have toppled — and then Khrushchev could easily take a chance on physical penetration of Western territory; for instance in the most comfortable way of sending East-German "Volkspolizei" into the emptied space.

While The Summit Summit Stands To Gain . . .

However, for the moment, everything proceeds according to Camp David plans — and beautifully. Khrushchev is entirely pleased with the postponement of the "summit meeting" till May, 1960, the confused American press reports to the contrary notwithstanding. Ever since his visit to the United States it has been clear that Khrushchev was learning fast about domestic American politics. And all he has learned made him want to postpone the "summit meeting" as far as possible into 1960 — as close as possible to the American Presidential elections.

For what did Khrushchev learn about American politics? Merely elementary stuff: that normally the Democrats are America's majority party; that the Republicans have a Presidential chance only if they present either an "exceptional" candidate or an "exceptional" issue; that Eisenhower, the only "exceptional" Republican candidate in sight, can no longer be presented; that, therefore, he and his party bitterly need an "exceptional" issue; and that this issue could only be "peace in our time" — and nothing else.

The consequences of such elementary

stuff Khrushchev learned about were terrific. For the first time he really understood why America now would be paying for the privilege of being skinned at a "summit meeting," although in the preceding years he, Khrushchev, was willing to pay a little himself: If Eisenhower's party were to go into the 1960 elections with the "peace hopes" of a "summit meeting" shattered, they would lose. So now was the time to make Eisenhower pay through his nose — or, anyway, Adenauer's. Now Khrushchev understood that the "summit meeting" had to be held as late as possible. Why? Because the closer it was to the November elections, the less could the Republicans afford to let it collapse.

From American Elections . . .

If a "summit meeting" would have ended in failure in, say, December 1959, the Republicans would still have had almost another year to work themselves into the American voters' graces. But if a "summit meeting" were to collapse in, say, June 1960 — practically at Convention time, and just a few weeks ahead of the crucial elections —, then the Republicans would be sunk. No "peace in our time" — no Nixon in the White House. *Ergo*: a "summit meeting" in May or June 1960 must under no circumstances collapse. *Ergo*: the Republicans will be ready to pay almost any price for its "success." *Ergo*: Khrushchev has a Double-Nelson hold on Eisenhower. And he is going to play it for all it is worth.

Well, what *is* it worth? What makes things for Eisenhower morally and politically so easy is Khrushchev's strategic timetable: At this stage, the strategic needs of the Soviet bloc demand

European Survey

surrender of no outright American position. All that's needed, at this moment, is some kind of recognition of the Ulbricht regime in East Germany. In short, the payments Khrushchev will demand at the "summit meeting" will have to be made in German currency exclusively — and why shouldn't Eisenhower pay with Adenauer's money? Why not, indeed, if the Germans permit him to?

This may be the shrewdest and most effective piece of the cunning Soviet strategy: that Germany, so short a time after the stinking concentration camps were opened, has become the most precious part of the West — and that this Germany, unless it is ready to play, "again," the world's naughty boy and disturber of peace, would have to defy the "peace-loving" West in order to save itself as well as the West. What a plot! Straight out of Hollywood—black and white, villains and squares, guilt and atonement! And, I am sorry to report, the profound embarrassment is getting even Old Adenauer: Since the issue has been cut to the bones—"only the naughtiness of the evil Germans can disturb peace in our times" — he has lost much of his touch. He is getting self-conscious. His profoundly European convictions block his German realism: Now that all depends on his firmness in the defense of German sovereignty, now he is much too afraid of being "misunderstood" in the West to act firmly and in time.

For he *would* have to act firmly and in time. Firmly: he would have to declare solemnly and bindingly that the German Government will never, never, never recognize "another Germany" or the Ulbricht regime. In time: he would have to declare this several months

ahead of the "summit meeting" so that neither Eisenhower nor Macmillan could even claim they had not been forewarned and, thus, at the last moment had to proceed against the declared will of their German ally. Adenauer is now going through his painful "moment of truth"; he would have to act now — or he will act never; and he has to act on nothing but his own resources, nothing but his own commitment to the elementary moral right of any nation — the right to self-determination.

From German Past History . . .

It is a lonely moment for a very lonely man. Since the death of John Foster Dulles there is nobody in the West's ruling council who speaks his language — the language of firmness. Not even Charles de Gaulle is much of a help. For the President of France, himself deserted by the Anglo-Saxon powers, must play his own marbles in his own game. For a while it looked as if Adenauer could rely on French endorsement. It no longer looks that way. De Gaulle is so alarmed by the preliminaries of the "summit meeting" that he is embarking upon pretty dangerous schemes of playing Khrushchev against Eisenhower, Macmillan against Adenauer — anything to improve France's bargaining position in a wholesale sell-out. (I know that the Editor of this magazine so genuinely admires Charles de Gaulle that he can hardly bear my casting a shadow on this great figure. But I admire him myself; and not I cast the shadows, but his own desperate efforts to escape do. Charles de Gaulle is still the only other sage and courageous leader of the West, right next to Adenauer. But he is no longer a pillar of

European Survey

Western strength. Nor, perhaps, is Adenauer. Macmillan and Eisenhower may have won out.) During the last few weeks it has become painfully clear that France is not going to make German policies. The task has been returned to Adenauer. The world will not be one iota more German than Germany. If Germany permits the West to sell her down the river, the West will do exactly this. But if Adenauer acts as he should, he is running the risk that Western "public opinion" will jump on the "unteachable" Germans. This is Dr. Adenauer's terrible dilemma. It seems to have immobilized even him.

The few months that separate us from the abyss at the "summit" may be the West's last lease on life. If Adenauer regains his commanding stature, and clarifies to the American people that Eisenhower would be acting against the unbending will of Germany, our only wholly reliable ally on the Continent, that lease may be extended. In the meantime, the lesser continental powers behave as if they had given up—and leading in the escape race is of course Italy.

And From Italian Confusion . . .

On the eve of Italian President Gronchi's "state visit" to Moscow the Segni Government has yielded to leftist Fanfani. Readers of this department will recall that the great issue between the two wings in Italy's Christian Democratic Party was the question of forming a coalition with Nenni. The leftist faction, under the leadership of Fanfani (and Gronchi), remained with its frantic advocacy of such a suicidal course in the minority; while the majority, led by Segni and Moro, insisted that Nenni would have first to prove his demo-

cratic reliability by breaking *openly and forever* with the Communists. Segni and Moro retained this position for exactly six weeks. Then, on December 18, they turned 180 degrees: On that day, Segni offered Nenni governmental partnership, *without* any definite separation of the Socialists from the Communists, if only Nenni were ready to help the Christian Democrats form a regional government in Sicily.

As it happened, Nenni was not ready. And the Sicilian "Catholic" clown, who for the last couple of years ruled the region with the help of the Communists against Segni's party, is back in power with the same support, Nenni's wishes to the contrary notwithstanding. The Communists won out in Sicily—and Nenni in all of Italy. For, entirely aside from the puny issues of regional Sicilian quarrels, Segni has now officially established his new belief: that Nenni is "governmental"—an entirely acceptable partner for the Christian Democrats. With one stroke Fanfani has conquered the entire party: Now even Segni is committed to a coalition with Nenni who, on his part, didn't even have to pay for such a development with an "anti-Communist" declaration. On the contrary. After Segni had given him formal recognition Nenni, who understands the essence of power politics, made it a point to rub it in on the Christian Democrats that he, Nenni, will never cease to believe in "the unity of the working class"—i.e., that he will of course continue to act as proxy for the Communist Togliatti.

As I forewarned my readers some time ago, no one in Italy wants the Segni Government to resign from office before Spring. So Segni will carry

European Survey

on for a while — entirely with Nenni's approval. Then, around the time of the "summit meeting," there will take place the fateful change of guards. And this is no longer Nenni's speculation and Fanfani's dream. This is now the official determination of the *entire* Christian Democratic Party. For all practical purposes Italy, as the first European country, has already accepted Togliatti's advice that "the popular front must be considered the logical outgrowth of the spirit of Camp David."

* * *

Even A British Newspaper Confesses Concern . . .

Sometimes, I confess, I am so stupefied by the unanimous misrepresentation of European developments by the American press that I most anxiously and gratefully grab an opportunity to introduce unexpected testimony on my behalf. Such an opportunity — and it came, God knows, unexpectedly — arose on December 27, 1959, when, of all papers, the *Observer*, London (otherwise a staunch supporter of the British Establishment) published its annual review of events, "The Year." There I found the following description of last year's European events:

"In his attempts to refashion the old alliances President Eisenhower relied largely on the magic of his own personality . . . Yet when the 'Western summit' meeting was held at the close of the year the NATO alliance remained very shaky:

"*Politically*: France and Germany still had little sympathy with the British and American approach to Russia. General de Gaulle's determination to act as the equal of Britain and America had resulted in his arranging a Khrushchev visit to France for early 1960;

"*Militarily*: France's determination to pursue an individual line and to concentrate on the Algerian war led to a considerable weakening of General Norstad's command, and the postponement of effective NATO integration even in Air Defense;

"*Economically*: The split which began on January 1, 1959, when the Common Market of the Six (France, Germany, Italy and Benelux) came into being, was aggravated later in the year when Britain replied with a rival organization of the 'Outer Seven' (Britain, Scandinavia, Switzerland, Austria, Portugal). There seemed every sign that a trade war within NATO was about to develop."

Thus spake the *Observer*, than which no English paper could be more Eisenhower-prone. I thought it would reassure the readers of this department that I am, after all, not just capricious when my European reports differ so fantastically from all that the *New York Times* journalistic ambassadors keep telling headquarters. The London *Observer* and I agree in this summary of Eisenhower's European successes in 1959: (1) NATO is ruined as a military structure; (2) the American system of alliances throughout Western Europe is collapsing; (3) Europe is farther from economic integration than it has been since 1945. On the other hand, Eisenhower has just promised in New Delhi to fight for Nehru's "integrity."

This is what the American Establishment calls America's most successful President of recent history. He has still one year to go. So, at the beginning of this last year, let us pray for the United States.

A MILITARY OFFICER LOOKS AT DISARMAMENT

by

CAPTAIN PAUL R. SCHRATZ, U.S.N.

The animals had met to disarm. The lion looking sidewise at the bull declared: "Horns must be abolished." The eagle looking at the tiger, said: "Paws and especially claws must be abolished." The bear, in his turn, said: "All arms must be abolished: all that is necessary is a universal embrace."

—Salvador de Madariaga,
The League of Nations, 1922

THE BELIEF is quite widespread that the military officer looks upon disarmament simply as a means by which somebody else is trying to take away his livelihood. The belief is equally widespread that disarmament is the only key to the problem of true international peace. Unfortunately, neither is quite true. Doing away with weapons may eliminate the means of waging war but it does not remove the likelihood that war will occur. An armament race is merely a symptom of the actual problem. The real problem is unsolved political differences. Armament races are *caused* by conflicts of political influence. We cannot solve the conflict by disarmament, nor will disarmament eliminate war unless the political conflict is first resolved. If unresolved political problems caused rearmament, it is a mere manipulation of symptoms to attempt to gain agreement on disarmament among nations divided by incompatible political interests.

The greatest writer and naval strategist the U.S. Navy ever produced was Rear Admiral Alfred T. Mahan. One

of Admiral Mahan's major contributions to international politics was a clear exposition of the mutual dependence between the military policy of a nation and her foreign policy. The foundation of military policy is national policy. The military force of a country is only the outward display of her national influence, and hence disarmament in policy must precede disarmament in weapons. Military and national policies must be consistent or disaster may follow. We can disarm only to the extent we desire to retreat from our international commitments.

Support within this country for disarmament proposals is not so much a symptom of a desire to withdraw from international commitments as it is a desire to reduce the expense of supporting military force levels necessary to carry out our commitments and enforce our policies. By disarmament we usually imply reduction in arms. In the modern era of rapidly changing technology where each of the services periodically produces weapons systems capable of carrying out similar missions in support

A Military Officer Looks At Disarmament

of national policy, the military planner has a grave responsibility to observe the greatest skill in phasing out the old as it is replaced by the new. New and powerful weapons must be adequate in numbers, not that any single service should be able to enforce national policy, but that the aggregate military effort of all the services may provide the necessary strength. The military principle of economy of force dictates that each service contribute only to greater *flexibility, mobility, and balance*, so that the aggregate strength of the nation is adequate to support national policy.

We have violated this principle in the recent past. The strategic bombing attacks on Japanese industrial areas in World War II, which ran concurrently with the naval attacks on Japanese shipping, were somewhat redundant since the industries being attacked had already been starved of raw materials by the strangling pressure of sea power. Vice Admiral Ruge of the Federal German Navy carried this idea much further in his analysis of World War II. "The attempt at an independent air strategy according to Douhet's [the apostle of strategic air power] ideas was a complete failure . . . the strategic air forces involved a tremendous scale of effort merely to duplicate other operations." Admiral Ruge, however, leans too far backward. The lesson to be drawn is not that strategic air power had no function in the war. Far from it. In the Pacific, for instance, the naval campaign and the allied amphibious operations were absolutely necessary not only to provide the means for economic strangulation of Japan but to conquer the very bases from which the strategic air effort was to be launched. General Doolittle also tends to miss the lesson

in a statement he made in 1945: "The navy had the transport to make invasion possible; the ground forces had the power to make it successful; and the B-29 made it unnecessary."

The general does not suggest how Iwo Jima, Saipan, Tinian, Guam, and Okinawa, from which the B-29s operated, could have been captured without sea power and greatly superior (carrier based) tactical air power in the objective area during the island-hopping campaign. Nor does he indicate how the B-29s could have survived in unescorted day and night raids over Japan had not the strangling sea blockade cut off virtually all the petroleum sources from the Japanese Empire and from her defending fighter planes.

The strategic air effort added flexibility and diversity to the naval offensive. Each helped make the other possible. Where a single strategy would have invited defeat through its inflexibility, the combined air-sea effort provided two pronged elements to the success of the grand strategy. But in the modern era of fantastically expensive weapons, however, the vast cost of each strategy dictates the most careful economy of force in the combined efforts of the three services in the common defense.

The success of military strategy in meeting possible variations in enemy threat today requires great mobility, flexibility and balance in offensive strength, coordinated to fit the grand strategy. Cost considerations dictate utmost austerity in force levels. "Disarmament," therefore, can mean relaxation of force levels only as receding danger to vital interests will allow. Great Britain has a strategic air force and nuclear weapon capability which could in-

A Military Officer Looks At Disarmament

flict serious damage on the United States. We do not arm to counter this capability because it is no threat. Nor does Great Britain arm either to counter the United States nuclear weapon superiority or to forestall the development of a United States Navy superior to her own—a fact she fought innumerable wars to prevent. As long as vital interests of both countries are in harmony, each acts with confidence in the other's intentions. Lacking any substantial area of agreement with the Soviet Bloc, even on non-military problems, however, the hope for an honest mutual reduction in force levels, which would weaken the sole stabilizing influence on the world political scene, is wishful.

The military would welcome any ef-

fort whereby we can reduce the state of tension and reduce the overseas operational commitments. We too are heartily in favor of reducing the deployment of ships, aircraft squadrons and troops which, after all, work their greatest hardship directly upon us military—and upon our families. We too would welcome relief from the tax burden shared by military and civilian alike. We will do our very best to insure that national policy is enforceable not by each service but by all. But we have pledged our hopes, our sacred honor—and our lives—in the nation's trust, and we ask only for the means to preserve our pledges in supporting the political and economic policies of the United States in our modern world.

WE PAUSE TO REMARK

Columbia University has announced that it will no longer have Charles Van Doren on its faculty. Almost simultaneously it announced, with pride, an exchange pact with the University of Moscow whereby Columbia will have several Communist professors on its faculty. The *Brooklyn Tablet* wants to know if this is an improvement.

* * *

And the *Manchester Union Leader* asks how soon Mr. Van Doren will be invited to lecture on ethics at Harvard.

* * *

We have just heard of an entirely new reason for wanting a million dollars. It hangs on one of the many versions of an old yarn.

A judge who was long on pompousness and short on knowledge of the law, in the midst of a heated argument with counsel, fined the lawyer twenty dollars for contempt of court. The lawyer immediately whipped two tens out of his pocket, reached up and laid them beside the judge's gavel. "I'll pay it gladly, your Honor," he said. "It's a just debt."

Now we have a lawyer friend who wants a million dollars so that he can express himself freely about our present Supreme Court, and be able to pay any fine justly proportionate to his contempt.

* * *

In a speech before the Bond Club of Chicago a couple of months ago, Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi stated: "After what I have seen and heard recently, I can report to you with full responsibility that Russia today is bankrupt. She is bankrupt economically and also, more important, ideologically."

Although our nation, too, is very near insolvency, our government will undoubtedly save the Soviets from financial collapse, as it has on other occasions in the past. But just how any political organism, which is itself as completely bankrupt ideologically as the present administration in Washington, can help anybody else in that area is somewhat beyond us.

In Place Of A Thousand Words



A Soviet Boss Takes Time Out To Daydream.

OUR CORRUPT MONETARY BLOODSTREAM

by

WALTER E. SPAHR

Executive Vice President

Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy

Nationalizing our people's gold, 1933 and since . . .

When the United States Government confiscated the people's gold, beginning with the suspension of redemption of nongold currency in gold coin in 1933, and devaluation in 1934, their gold was nationalized. The monetary bloodstream of this nation was given the cancerous qualities that characterize the currencies in Communist and Socialist countries.

The Constitution of the United States authorizes Congress "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures; to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States" (Article I, Section 8, Paragraphs 5-6). It does not authorize Congress to confiscate the people's gold money. When this nation was plunged into irredeemable currency, and fiat money was issued, 1861-1878, the people's gold was not confiscated; apparently there was no official opinion to the effect that the central government had such power or that its exercise would be appropriate.

Devaluation of our dollar and the related act of "compensating" with irredeemable currency . . .

After our central government demanded in 1933 that the people's gold

be relinquished to it, the Administration began a process of driving down the value of our irredeemable currency in terms of gold, and on January 31, 1934, the President devalued our standard gold dollar approximately forty-one percent, thus raising the price of an ounce of fine gold approximately sixty-nine percent — that is, from \$20.67 to \$35.00.

The Constitution of the United States provides (Article V, of First Ten Amendments): "... nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." When the United States confiscated the people's gold, beginning in 1933, it gave them as compensation irredeemable currency at the rate of \$20.67 per fine ounce of gold. Then under authority of the Gold Reserve Act of January 30, 1934, the Administration marked up the value of the gold held by the United States Treasury, then and since, to \$35.00 per fine ounce, pocketing the difference as "profit."

This act and resulting government profit should be revealing as to the nature of the "just compensation" provided the holders of gold who were required to relinquish it at \$20.67 per fine ounce. But they found themselves helpless; the United States Supreme Court upheld the Congress and the Administration in this act of confiscation and this form of providing "just compensa-

Our Corrupt Monetary Bloodstream

tion."

That method of taking private property for public use was characteristic of ruthless Communist governments; it constituted denial of justice within the provisions and spirit of our United States Constitution.

The question of nongovernment purchases and sales of gold under irredeemable currency . . .

If a government inflicts an irredeemable currency on a people, there is no virtue, from the point of view of the national welfare, in allowing them to have or to hold gold with which to build a speculative market in terms of the irredeemable currency. The reasons are: (1) the gold is a demonetized metal domestically, and speculation in it in terms of irredeemable paper money, usually depreciated in terms of gold, confuses people as to the real state of affairs and as to the correct solution; and (2) if the government holds the monetary gold, that government is in a stronger position, than otherwise would be the case, to institute redemption at the proper rate between gold and nongold currency.

Our currency is a corrupted bloodstream . . .

Since our currency touches practically all our people, they are contaminated with a corrupted monetary bloodstream. Its effects are many and in some respects subtle. The withdrawal from the monetary bloodstream of the gold corpuscles which, within broad limits, keep other money and credit corpuscles in order, has produced the typical results; profligate government spending, great growth in public and private debt, large monetization of national debt, extensive

socialization, artificial exhilaration, bloating, intoxication, fever, chills, nervousness, irritability, irresponsibility, dishonesty, immorality, decline in the purchasing power of the currency, and fear of a redeemable currency as the drug addict fears abandonment of his drug — all these mixed with elements of a pronounced industrial revolution and a fantastic scattering of the United States dollars and other resources among the nations of the world. The dishonesty involved in, and flowing from, the use of irredeemable currency permeates practically all aspects of our economic, social, and political system and provides another instance of how corruption grows "as naturally as a fungus on a muck heap" (Andrew D. White in his *Fiat Money Inflation in France*) when a nation degenerates to the level of irredeemable currency.

The pulsation of this diseased bloodstream through an economy finally weakens and undermines the nation involved; and, unless removed before the logical final consequences are reached, eventually brings destruction — economic, political, and social.

This contaminated bloodstream destroys the people's control over the public purse . . .

When the people of a nation operate with a redeemable currency every individual is able to exercise direct control over the government's use of the people's purse to the extent of his purchasing power. If he is disturbed by government profligacy or unsound banking practices, he can conserve his purchasing power by converting it into gold. He is not compelled to combine forces with others in some form of organization in an effort, usually futile,

Our Corrupt Monetary Bloodstream

to protect his wealth.

If a considerable number of people demand redemption of nongold currency in gold, the banks experience the impact which is passed on to the United States Treasury and thence to Congress and the Administration. These demands for redemption constitute red flags of warning which the banks and central government are required to respect if a redeemable currency is to be maintained.

The people may be misinformed and misled as to when demand for redemption is desirable, individually and socially; but this does not alter the importance of the right of redemption. For example, in April and May, 1931, the percentage of monetary gold drawn into domestic circulation was the lowest on record (1.44). Apparently the reason was that the possibility of non-redemption was not raised or discussed in any important manner despite the great distress under which our people were laboring. Similarly, in 1929, in the face of the runaway stock market, the percentage of our gold stock drawn into domestic use was at the relatively low monthly average of 2.5.

The fundamental consideration is not that the people may not always act wisely in large numbers in respect to demanding redemption of nongold currency; it is, rather, that they lose all effective power to control the public purse unless they have the right to demand redemption of nongold currency. Officers of government and the banking system cannot know whether the people, if disturbed, will exercise the power which a redeemable currency places in their hands; and it is respect for, or fear of, that power that keeps governments and banks from going as far in the use

of money and credit as tends to be the case when the people are reduced to a state of helplessness by having an irredeemable currency thrust upon them.

A redeemable currency may, and frequently does, depreciate in a pronounced degree because of the misuse of credit; but it cannot depreciate as far as can irredeemable currency. The limit to the latter is zero.

When the government cut all the wires from individuals to the central signal system in Washington, it opened the way to the government's orgy of profligate spending, to an unlimited depreciation of our currency, and to the ultimate destruction of this nation. The central government and Federal Reserve banks (and other banks), freed from the proper responsibility for redemption of their bills of exchange, now have an unrestrainable control over the people of this nation; and this is a power and freedom they endeavor to preserve for themselves.

The fact that the people have lost control of their public purse constitutes a deadly danger to the wellbeing of the United States.

Why did the Roosevelt Administration institute this dangerous system in 1933? . . .

The correct answer seems to be that the President and Congress desired the unrestrainable powers which an irredeemable currency placed in their hands. Former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau described that development accurately when he stated: "As the President put it, they [the Roosevelt Administration] unshackled themselves and the federal government." And further: "They made the manipulation of the value of the currency an open and

Our Corrupt Monetary Bloodstream

admitted instrument of public policy." (John Morton Blum's *From the Morgenthau Diaries: Years of Crisis 1928-1938*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1959, p. 75.)

Subsequent Administrations and Congresses have maintained the same grip on the people's purse . . .

The majority of all subsequent Administrations, Congresses, and Federal Reserve authorities have demonstrated their desire for the powers which irredeemable currency gave, and gives, them and takes from the people. The spending orgy of our national government since 1933 has been the logical consequence.

Although much time, effort, and money have been expended by concerned individuals and organizations to arrest and, if possible, reverse the tide toward uncontrollable centralized government and the related socialization in this nation, the evidence should be clear that they have not succeeded. And there is no good reason for supposing that they can succeed until our currency is made redeemable — given the proper quality of integrity — and the power of the purse is returned to the people where it belongs in a republic.

Nevertheless, all individuals and organizations of this type should do all within their power to keep important facts regarding these dangerous developments before as many people as possible.

Public attitude toward the use of irredeemable currency . . .

Relatively few people in a nation are monetary economists. A consequence is that the great majority of people tend

to accept without serious question or clear understanding the monetary standard and system provided by the government. But beyond this fact lies another: If the people of a nation are given a taste of irredeemable currency their reactions are much like those of drug addicts. They embrace such a currency vigorously, desire more and more of it, and oppose all efforts to supply them with a better currency. Their daily experiences seem to indicate in many ways that irredeemable currency is beneficial, individually and socially. The increase in their incomes, the expansion of the economy, and a variety of other experiences seem to support their impressions that the economic world is good and growing better. They may protest against the high cost of living, taxation, and similar difficulties, and even against socialization and mounting national debt, but they do not desire to abandon a depreciated and depreciating currency.

Vested interests in a depreciated currency become multitudinous and deeply involved, and warnings by many (not all) leaders of large organizations against further depreciation of the currency are for the most part platitudinous and futile. They are in high degree cases of pretended obeisance to economic orthodoxy and are efforts to advertise one's supposedly virtuous thinking. But they are not effective, and one may suppose that many or most of the warnings against "inflation" by floaters with the tide either have not been studied carefully as to futility or are not intended to be effective.

False labels and slogans are widely or generally utilized, such as "maintaining the integrity of our currency,"

Our Corrupt Monetary Bloodstream

despite the fact that lack of integrity is the characteristic of irredeemable currency. References to the integrity and virtues of a redeemable currency are avoided. The depreciation in the purchasing power of our currency is to be "prevented," but its current depreciation is generally passed over in silence. The spending orgy of our Federal government is not related by such issuers of warnings to the use of irredeemable currency. The fact that such a currency is used by all totalitarian governments and is advocated by Socialists and Communists in this country is not mentioned, much less emphasized. The degree of socialization that has taken place in this country since early 1933 is largely ignored.

In brief, the common pronouncements on "inflation" are those of people caught up in the tide of irredeemable currency who intend to float with it and to profit by it if possible. That is true of the majority in our national Administration, Congress, the Federal Reserve authorities, national bureaucratic organizations, large business enterprises and foundations, and a multitude of others.

Even though monetary economists constitute a very small percentage of the population, the majority of them, beginning in 1933, have been *political* economists working for more and more central government and government management of the economy in the form of Socialism, Communism, or otherwise. Such monetary economists are advocates of "managed" irredeemable currency and oppose restoration of a redeemable currency. It is not to be expected, therefore, that economists as a whole will be leaders in a return to sanity.

How can integrity be restored to our currency? . . .

Just as President Roosevelt and a co-operative Congress deprived our people of a redeemable currency without any popular mandate or consent, so, in all probability, will a currency with the quality of integrity — a redeemable currency without further devaluation—be restored to our people. This is one area in which the leadership rests with a President and Secretary of the Treasury who can and will use all the political machinery at their disposal to persuade a majority of Congress to institute a redeemable currency in the national welfare and the safety of this nation.

In so far as this author is aware, there has never been a popular movement of sufficient importance to be successful in behalf of the abandonment of the drug of irredeemable currency and the adoption of a redeemable currency. Such a currency is initiated by statesmen at the head of, or in influential positions in, the central government.

The practical and urgent question in this country is how to get a President and Secretary of the Treasury who, with the co-operation of the majority of Congress, will provide our people with a redeemable currency. Until that is accomplished, this nation can be expected to be in serious economic and political danger.

And even after our people are given a sound currency, many other reforms should be instituted. A proper monetary standard is analagous to sound rails on a railway. They do not cause wrecks, but they cannot prevent them. A gold standard is not a cure-all for monetary and fiscal mismanagement, just as good rails on a railway cannot control reck-

Our Corrupt Monetary Bloodstream

less drivers of locomotives or the use of dangerous rolling stock or other human mistakes which result in wrecks or other unfortunate consequences.

But a gold standard and redeemable currency are necessary prerequisites to good monetary and fiscal management, to preservation of private enterprise and

a healthy economy, to avoidance of thorough-going Socialism or Communism, to control by the people of the public purse, to responsible and wise government, and to assured preservation of our Republic and Federal system of government.

BULLETS

All the flowers of all the tomorrows
are in the seeds of today.

Chinese Proverb

There is no limit to what can be accomplished if it doesn't matter who gets the credit.

Ralph Waldo Emerson

Policeman: "How did this accident happen?"

Driver: "My wife fell asleep in the back seat."

Uncle Mat

If I look confused it's because I'm thinking.

Let's Have Better Mottoes Association

A conference is a place where conversation is substituted for the dreariness of labor and the loneliness of thought.

A Member Of The Bored

Capitalists upholding socialism are like flies forming a protective association to take care of spiders.

Elizabeth Staples

If you were setting a trap to capture all mankind, what would you use for bait? Peace.

J. Kesner Kahn

The American eagle cannot continue to fly on two left wings.

Clarence Manion

According to press reports from South America, in a recent political campaign in Sao Paulo, Brazil, a rhinoceros won the election by a write-in vote. We've never done that in the United States but we've elected jackasses to office time and again.

Ida Darden,

In THE SOUTHERN CONSERVATIVE

A diplomat is a man who must think twice before saying nothing.

G. L. Mehta

Girls at college are of two strata;
Those with dates and those with data.

Richard Armour

The narrower the mind, the broader the statement.

Good Housekeeping

He who accepts evil without protesting against it is really cooperating with it.

Henry David Thoreau

Let knowledge grow from more to more

But more of reverence in us dwell.

Alfred Lord Tennyson

IF YOU WANT IT STRAIGHT...

De Gaulle Makes A Sacrifice Play

On September 16, 1959 General Charles de Gaulle, President of France, surprised most of the world, and most of his own followers, by making a quite conciliatory offer to the "Algerian rebels"—the Communist-led terrorists usually known as the F.L.N. One of the three possibilities contained in this offer was the eventual complete independence of Algeria, if so voted by the Algerians themselves.

Under the practical and historical circumstances that are the framework for developments in Algeria, there would be no more chance of a free and fair election when the time came than the Communists allowed in Poland in January, 1947 — or the supporters of Ngo dinh Diem allowed in South Vietnam in 1955. And the vote for separation from France, into which enough of the native Moslems of Algeria will be frightened and coerced and betrayed, will mean the surrender of Algeria into a tightening and ever more brutal Communist tyranny, just as surely as the Polish "election" removed all remaining barriers to the police-state rule over Poland by Stalin's Lublin Gang.

Even the other two, and less drastic proposals, in the September 16 offer, constituted a *de facto* recognition of FLN claims and pressures which was a mighty boost to their prestige and morale, against the former very firm and very correct treatment of them by de Gaulle as simply gangs of murderous traitors who deserved to be caught, tried, and executed or imprisoned for their crimes. The whole concession of undeserved standing to the FLN came as a stunning blow to those very followers of de Gaulle who, familiar with the massive cruelties of the FLN and with the other true aspects of the Algerian situation, had been most instrumental in bringing de Gaulle to power. They had no longer been willing to stomach the repeated and pusillanimous yielding of previous French governments to the pressures, put on them by the Eisenhower ad-

If You Want It Straight . . .

ministration (with huge assists from Senator John Kennedy), to be more kind and considerate towards this FLN Communist gang. In fact some of our readers will remember that it was a secret letter from President Eisenhower, urging a further softening in the French Government's firm attitude towards the Algerian rebels (which letter could not be kept secret), that had precipitated Gaillard's fall and the assumption of power by de Gaulle.

So this "compromise" by de Gaulle on September 16, of the same tenor as, but of much more far-reaching significance than, previous "compromises" by preceding French heads of state, was an extremely daring and even dangerous concession for him to make. It very nearly provoked civil war, it cost him the formal renunciation of support by some of his strongest backers, and for a while at least it sharply weakened the assurance of his leadership. Naturally, the question has been hotly discussed, both in public and private, as to why de Gaulle made a move so far to the left of his projected course.

To Please Washington

The answer was simple, and monotonously familiar. De Gaulle too had modified his stand under pressure from, and in an effort to satisfy the "anti-colonialism" cant of, the American Government. The cry of "colonialism" has been used as a weapon by the Communists for nearly forty years, as a means of driving European nations and nationals out of various areas of other continents, so that those areas could be made colonies of the Soviet empire. During the last twenty of those forty years a powerful partner in helping the Soviets to perpetrate this cruel fraud has been the United States Government. It is only during those twenty years that the Soviets have made their important conquests, and have become so increasingly successful in their constant drive "against imperialism," as a means of establishing *Soviet imperialism* in the "liberated" countries. And the same tremendous assistance to the Communists in this

If You Want It Straight . . .

program, which our government gave them in China, in Indonesia, and elsewhere, is being repeated in Algeria today. It is being repeated so insistently, in so many clever ways, that de Gaulle felt himself obliged to give ground.

In Return For Support

BUT — unlike his predecessors, de Gaulle exacted a *quid pro quo*. Being fully aware that the Communists thrive on increasing prestige and “respectability,” that they gain far more by propaganda and diplomatic “victories” than they ever do by tanks or planes, and being much concerned about the forthcoming big debate in the United Nations over the “Algerian questions,” de Gaulle’s government in effect made to our government the following proposal:

“All right. To show that we are not tyrannical imperialists, but are just as ‘liberal’ and ‘progressive’ and well disposed towards the ‘self-determination’ of ‘colonial peoples’ as is the United States; and to show that our primary concern is simply to live up to our responsibilities to the Algerians themselves, especially to that vast majority who (we believe) want to remain loyal to the French Republic of which they are a part—we’ll make just as great a concession towards enabling the Algerians to determine their own political future as anybody could possibly ask. We insist only that the FLN, now shouting so loud for independence, allow a sufficient degree of law and order and peaceful atmosphere to be reestablished, as a prerequisite, so that the real wishes of the Algerians can be determined. We’ll make this offer, instead of proceeding on our present campaign simply to exterminate these murderous guerillas, if the United States Government, believing that this is not only fair but liberal, will then stand with France in the forthcoming debates and votes in the United Nations, so that the Communists will not simply seize on this concession as a means of demanding more. We’ll yield so much and so generously, if the United States will stand with us in our efforts to put this offer

If You Want It Straight . . .

into practical effect, instead of letting it be used by the FLN merely as a sign of weakness on our part, as a means of claiming recognition and standing which we have not accorded them, and as simply another victorious step on their part towards being accepted as the present provisional government and the future *de jure* government of all of Algeria."

The French had good reason to "lay it on the line" in this way. For within the framework for future actions and developments which this offer would establish, the votes within the United Nations would be quite important. The support of France by the United States in these votes would be even more important. And just a year before, when a less significant but still crucial resolution of the United Nations about the Algerian question had come to a vote, the United States delegate, Henry Cabot Lodge, had suddenly deserted France at the last minute and voted against her. To the French that action by Lodge had seemed — justifiably, we believe — to be a clear case of *lâchage* (which probably translates most accurately as "dirty betrayal"). They wanted to make certain that, if they made so costly an effort as their offer of September 16 would represent, towards getting the Algerian question settled on the fairest conceivable terms to the Algerians themselves, the United States Government would not doublecross them again to help the FLN to make political hay out of their "weakness."

Which Is Faithfully Promised

They were assured that this would not be the case, and that the United States Government would be very happy to throw and maintain its support behind the French Government in so statesmanlike an undertaking. As the debate did finally get under way over the Algerian problem, in various committees of the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge sided and voted with France. Up to the vote in the Political Committee on December 8, Lodge not only cast his vote for the French position; he was so positive in assurances of continuing to do so that the

If You Want It Straight . . .

French bolstered their strength all they could by letting it be known that the United States would back them all the way. Then, at the final vote in the General Assembly, on December 12, with no advance warning and after some Machiavellian maneuverings that morning to make the vote more disastrous to France, the United States, in the person of Henry Cabot Lodge (God save the United States!), abstained from voting at all!

And Then Withdrawn

The abstention, after the widely publicized announcement that Lodge would vote *with* France, was far more harmful to de Gaulle and more helpful to the FLN than if Lodge had actually voted against France without any previous fanfare. As recently as December 9 the leading conservative French paper, *Le Figaro*, had proudly reported that "... our allies have revealed themselves, in these decisive hours, loyal and firm. To cite only the two largest, the Americans and English have not only supported us with their vote, but also have sustained us with their influence." By the evening of December 12 this very pride and assurance had been the cause of making the new *lâchage* by Lodge more devastating. And representatives of the FLN, even though the resolution in their favor still lost by the narrow margin of two votes, were able to shout gleefully to the French: "Gentlemen, you've been *bad*—by Cabot Lodge."

The resolution itself, which had been introduced by the Afro-Asiatic bloc, was too full of pious platitudes to justify the space for reprinting it here. By calling on "the two parties" to begin *simultaneous political and military* negotiations, passage of the resolution would have given United Nations support to the audacious pretense of the FLN that it should be recognized as the equal and opposite of the French Government for the purposes of such negotiations; and would have weakened if not destroyed the very core of the original French offer, which insisted on a cease-fire as a prerequisite to *any* negotiations. Both

If You Want It Straight . . .

points were of immense significance in connection with the future ability of the FLN to prostitute the eventual elections to their own purposes. And the fact that France won by two votes was overshadowed by the far more dramatic fact that the United States had deserted her in the showdown.

Just Before Eisenhower Appears In France

It was immediately on top of this development that President Eisenhower arrived in Paris for his visit with de Gaulle. (To the Communists *timing* is always a most important part of any maneuver, and their wire-pulling had brought this one off with clock-like precision.) How high feelings were running may be illustrated by the fact that one French diplomat in New York, livid with indignation, had been unable to refrain from going up to one of his American "colleagues" and saying: "You have conducted yourselves like contemptible scoundrels (*dégoutants*)."
General de Gaulle himself said: "It is a repetition, which takes place under the same conditions as the former betrayal."

When Lodge had made the similar dramatic abstention the year before (with the result that France had defeated that resolution by only *one* vote), John Foster Dulles had pulled himself out of the hole by talking to the French Foreign Minister, Couve de Murville, in terms of Lodge's personal character and "a certain lack of discipline." When Christian Herter tried that same line of explanation this time, Couve de Murville remarked drily that "in a year your ambassador should have been able to learn to suppress those spontaneous movements which occur to him."

When Herter then advanced the argument that both President Eisenhower and he himself had been out of the country, implying that Lodge took advantage of this fact to make his own decision, Couve de Murville replied that it did not seem to be a very good example of the coordination of attitudes. And when this explanation was reported to General de Gaulle,

If You Want It Straight . . .

he remarked: "I call it by another name and I shall say so, quite plainly, to President Eisenhower."

To Frustrate The French Still Further By His "Innocent" Platitudes

If some of our readers wondered about the visible lack of warmth between de Gaulle and Eisenhower, which showed up in some of the pictures and more or less between the lines in some of the news reports, this partial background to the visit will supply a partial explanation. And you would not have learned it from your newspapers. As highly important as was this clever footplay by Lodge on behalf of the FLN Communists, and as devastating as was this action of our government to Franco-American relations, to the honor of the United States, and to anti-Communist morale in the capitals of Western Europe, we are certain that not one of our readers in a hundred will have read one word before this about the whole episode.

About the only inkling the American people had of the affair was from a statement Eisenhower was quoted in our press as having made to de Gaulle. Somebody had had the gall to put in Eisenhower's mouth an offhand quip that after all the final resolution in the United Nations had been so watered down that even France should not have minded it. This was adding insult to injury. For while Prince Ali Khan had got the FLN crowd together on the morning of December 12, and gone through some motions of "softening" the resolution, the French did not consider that the changes constituted any improvement at all from their point of view. And besides, they were not now fussing about the resolution itself. They had beaten that. What they were so angry about was the desertion of their delegates by Cabot Lodge, after he had so clearly promised his support of France and let that support be announced in advance.

* * *

If You Want It Straight

The Sample Was Enlightening

We have covered the above incident in some detail because it is typical of the dozens of ways in which our government is constantly helping the FLN terrorists, and weakening the realistic anti-Communist stand of the present French Government. It is also typical of the literally hundreds of subtle ways in which Washington is actively aiding Communist regimes and Communist factions all over the world. Nobody wants to face these facts, and only a comparatively few well-informed patriots are willing to draw from them the terrifying conclusions that are objectively inescapable. Among those conclusions are:

(1) The Communists win their large victories through the cumulative effect of small gains;

(2) They make these gains chiefly through the conniving assistance of many of the very diplomats and officials who are supposed to be opposing them;

(3) Communist influences are now in almost complete working control of our government;

(4) The United States Government itself is today, and for the past many years has been, the most important and powerful single force promoting the world-wide Communist advance; and

(5) The one major problem which the Communists have left is keeping these facts sufficiently disguised, and hence unrecognized by the American people — until the extension of their reach and power *downward* in the United States makes disguise no longer necessary.

If we could put together the hundreds of pieces of this gigantic deception, at any given moment, in any way so that millions of our fellow citizens would read the assembled story and could see the picture whole, the momentum of their aroused anger would destroy the whole international conspiracy — and free hundreds of millions of people whom we have helped to enslave — in a matter of months.

That happy achievement is impossible, both because of our

If You Want It Straight

lack of resources and skill to do the job, and because of the propaganda-induced complacency of the American public. So we have to do what we can by letting one leaf of grass represent the whole pasture. We have dissected that leaf — and frequently others, in the past — as conscientiously as we could, to show you their composition. And we assure you that all of the leaves belong to the same *plot*.

And At Home Too

It is not only on the international front, however, or in connection with international affairs, that Washington is pushing the Marxist program as diligently and as rapidly as it dares. It is doing the same thing with regard to our domestic economic-political system. And again the complexity, subtlety, and immensity of the operation make any convincing total exposure as impractical as taking a detailed photograph of the solar system with a Brownie camera. Again we have to focus on just one tiny piece of the pattern, and ask you to project the whole from the part.

One such spot, at which few of our fellow torchbearers seem to have been looking with any careful attention, discloses on careful inspection at least three Marxist designs being faithfully carried out: (1) the waste of as huge sums of taxpayers' money as possible, to hasten the spending of our nation into bankruptcy; (2) the gradual elimination of small and middle-sized independent manufacturing businesses; and (3) the steady forcing of more and more businesses, by the carrot of bribery and the stick of coercion, to accept the tyrannical and arbitrary control over their prosperity and over their very existence by government bureaucrats. It is in the field of military procurement that, despite the many honest and honorable men in the various departments of that operation, the leftwing schemers are probably able to practice more deliberate and large-scale discrimination to serve their ends, with less notice by the public, than in any other area of bureaucratic activity.

If You Want It Straight

All Government contracts contain a clause permitting the Government to cancel at its "convenience." Thousands of contracts are so cancelled annually when the Government decides the material ordered is no longer needed, usually because of slipshod procurement and planning. Upon cancellation the small contractor, who has already spent his capital for material and labor, submits his claim for costs incurred — and nothing happens. Not having the resources to exist with his capital tied up for years, he is forced into bankruptcy, or into selling out, on the best terms he can get, to some larger contractor who enjoys bureaucratic favor. There is no telling how many thousands of small companies the Government has thus destroyed or eliminated over the past ten years. Such unpaid claims, many of them more than five years old — and since passage of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 these claims draw no interest — now total over 6½ billion dollars!

Through The Double Standard In Military Procurement

Large and favored firms, however, especially those with highly paid ex-Government executives to maintain the proper "contacts" in Government, usually have no such difficulty. They receive "progress payments" to such an extent during their contracts that they are usually paid up in event of cancellation. And with the Defense Department placing four million contracts per year (with a total value of about forty *billion* dollars), the leverage for favoritism and the opportunities for waste are enormous.

But specific illustrations speak louder than general arguments. Let's look at the double standard employed by the Air Force in its treatment of Kaiser industries and its treatment of a quite small contractor, Mercury Aircraft Products, Inc. (now Meteor Aircraft Products, Inc.) of Fairmont, West Virginia. We'll begin with a resume of Mercury's experience, prepared by themselves, which we think you will find convincing.

"In 1950 we learned from Air Force personnel at Wright

If You Want It Straight

Field of the need for a high-strength, light-weight Troop Seat, for use in troop carrying Aircraft. The Seat being used was available only from a sole source at excessive prices, excessive weights, and poor quality, resulting in Seat failures. We have letters from Air Force and Aircraft companies citing the dire need for another source and a better Troop Seat.

"We spent a great deal of our own time and money to design a Seat to exact Air Force requirements. Using our own funds and without borrowing a dollar from Government agencies, Mercury Aircraft Products was formed in 1951.

"In September, 1951, we quoted on the Troop Seats required by Chase Aircraft Company, Inc., W. Trenton, N.J., for the C-123 Aircraft. Forty-nine percent of Chase Aircraft stock had been bought by the Kaiser interests at Willow Run, near Detroit. Edgar Kaiser became President of Chase. Kaiser attempted to control Chase, placing Kaiser men in key positions, dictating policy, choosing subcontractors, etc. Kaiser people insisted that the Seat Order be placed with the Detroit competitor, a friend of theirs, at a much higher price. Chase wanted our Seats, as they were far lower in price, better designed, and saved 140 pounds of weight per ship. Kaiser pressured for their friend, and a hassle developed between Kaiser and Chase with us in the background.

"In January, 1952 we received the quarter-million-dollar Chase subcontract, but with it, Kaiser bad blood. Two weeks later Kaiser directed a Stop Work Order against us and tried in every way possible to cancel our Order. After five months (January to May, 1952) we learned from Chase that Kaiser had been unable to 'develop a cause' for cancellation, and we were advised to proceed. We have a Kaiser internal memorandum proving this situation.

"Three days after our Stop Work Order was lifted, Kaiser directed that another Inquiry be issued for the same quantity of Seats. We quoted, and were advised by Chase that we were the low bidder, but that this procurement was being handled by Kaiser. In August, 1952 this duplicate order was awarded by

If You Want It Straight

Kaiser to their 'preferred competitor,' at approximately fifty percent above our quoted price (\$304,000 compared to our \$205,000).

"Our letters to the Air Force, protesting this duplicate order at an excessive price, *were turned over by the Air Force Contracting Officer to Kaiser people for reply.* They replied that the duplicate order was to protect against our possible non-delivery. *This, after they had held up our Order for five months.*

"Having no previous aircraft experience, Kaiser was unable to manufacture the C-123. Our Delivery Schedule was stretched out four times by Kaiser, preventing us from delivering our Seats. The last stretch-out doubled the contract span from sixteen months to thirty-five.

"In June, 1953 after a Congressional investigation uncovered the collusion between Kaiser and the Air Force, Kaiser's contracts were cancelled. Our subcontract was cancelled by Chase-Kaiser in June, 1953 for Government convenience. Our cancellation claim amounted to \$128,000. Upon cancellation of its contracts, Kaiser bought the remainder of Chase stock, placing us in the very unfavorable position of trying to secure payment of our claim from the same Kaiser people who had objected to our Order. They refused to even attempt to settle our claim. After Kaiser had ignored our requests for settlement or partial payment for eight months, we asked the Air Force to expedite them. Instead, the Air Force defended Kaiser's lack of action, took over our claim for direct settlement over our protests, but refused to settle.

"Upon learning, in September, 1953, that the Air Force planned procurement of the C-123 Aircraft from another source, we offered the Air Force a no-charge cancellation, if our contract could be reinstated at the same prices, allowing us to deliver to the new manufacturer. Our offers were rejected.

"The new source for the C-123 requested our quotation for Seats. We, in turn, asked permission from the Air Force to bid on our Inventory, eleven different times. Each time we were refused.

If You Want It Straight

"Because of the delivery stretch-outs, all of our working capital was tied up in the Chase contract. Upon cancellation, we laid off all personnel and were unable to proceed on our other contracts. We requested a partial payment of our claim, in accordance with the Regulations, sixty-eight different times. Chase personnel requested that Kaiser makes us a badly needed partial payment. An Air Force Auditor, who spent two weeks in March, 1954 auditing our claim and checking our Inventory, recommended that the Air Force make an immediate partial payment. All requests were refused.

"We asked Air Force Secretary Talbott for assistance in April, 1954. Over the protests of his Assistant, Mr. Golden, a conference was held, at which Air Force personnel offered \$85,000 in full settlement of our \$128,000 claim. They refused to look at our cost records, refused to put their offer in writing, and later denied making it. The following month, the Air Force rendered a unilateral Determination, offering us \$72,000 as payment in full, with a pressure clause stating that if we did not accept that amount and deliver the Inventory within thirty days, the offer was reduced to \$24,000.

"The Detroit competitor, preferred by Kaiser, received his Order eight months after ours, so he should have incurred relatively little expense on his Order by the June, 1953 cancellation date. However, his claim was filed in an amount substantially larger than ours and was paid in full and approved by the Air Force in May, 1954, with his complete Inventory still in his possession.

"In June, 1954 we employed a public accounting firm to audit our claim. Their report stated that their audit, performed in accordance with the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, revealed that our Settlement Proposal fairly presented our claim.

"Although the Regulations state that Finished Products on hand should be shipped immediately and invoiced in the usual manner, neither Kaiser nor Air Force would allow us to ship our Finished Products. Finished Seats shipped in November,

If You Want It Straight

1954, in accordance with belated Air Force Instructions, have not as yet been paid for.

"We continued to request a fair negotiation conference as provided by the Regulations, and after nine months another conference was held with Air Force in January, 1955. They again refused to look at our records and would not even let the President of our company attend.

"The Air Force insisted that we take our case before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, which is manned by Air Force personnel, and which usually defends all Air Force actions. We informed ASBCA that since the Air Force would not advise us of the objectionable items of our claim, it was impossible for us to appear. We continued to request a fair negotiation conference, and were always refused.

"In April, 1957 we received an Air Force check for \$24,000 with a letter stating that it represented full payment of our claim. We promptly returned the check, advising that it would be acceptable as a partial payment, but not as payment in full, and were advised a few days later that the Air Force had closed its file on our case.

"In February, 1958 we contacted Assistant Air Force Secretary Golden and again requested that a fair effort be made to negotiate settlement of our claim. After his 'checking into' the matter for a couple of months, he advised us that nothing could be done. In order to toll a possible Statute, we filed suit against Chase-Kaiser in June, 1958 in the amount of \$400,000, including our claim, interest, storage charges, etc. A few days later, Air Force personnel visited our plant to check on the Inventory. We were then notified that a negotiation conference would be held with the Air Force on July 24 at Wright Field.

"At the conference in July, 1958, we were offered \$102,000 in settlement of our claim. We were told that any charges or expenses incurred since our claim was filed could not be considered. And that the Contracting Officer had been cautioned by Assistant Air Force Secretary Golden to report to him alone regarding our claim. In view of the five years that had elapsed

If You Want It Straight

since our Order was cancelled, and the settlement expenses, storage charges, etc., that we had incurred during this time, we rejected this \$102,000 offer, and requested that the negotiation include at least a portion of our additional expenses. We were refused another conference.

"The Government advised us that they would defend Kaiser against our pending litigation, and the Answer to our Complaint was belatedly filed by the U. S. Attorney. In November, 1958 a conference was held with the U. S. Attorney, at which we presented evidence of our claim and the Kaiser and Air Force lack of action. We offered to settle for the face value of our claim, \$128,000, if settlement could be arranged promptly. The U. S. Attorney agreed to recommend our proposed settlement, but stated that he would have to obtain Air Force information and concurrence from Washington. In January, 1959 he advised us that the information requested from Air Force had still not been received.

"When we entered the Troop Seat business, we put an end to a 'sole source' proposition which had cost the Air Force hundreds of thousands of dollars in overcharges, through lack of competitive prices. We received our subcontract as the low bidder, saving the Air Force many thousands of dollars. Our Seats were substantially lower in weight, saving the Air Force many thousands of pounds of airborne tonnage. We offered to settle our claim 'no charge,' thereby saving the Air Force \$128,000 (the whole amount of our claim). We have never requested nor received a dollar from any Government lending agency. In spite of the above performance, we have not received a nickel against our claim. But the Air Force has *admitted spending over half a million dollars to avoid paying it.*"

And Favors To Such Firms As Kaiser

Now let's look at the other side of this coin, after a few prefatory comments. For it really seems incredible that the American people could have become so indifferent to the co-

If You Want It Straight

lossal waste of their money and to utterly unjustifiable actions of their government as to allow this whole Kaiser monstrosity to develop and exist. But the facts are all there, nevertheless, for anybody who cares to look. And they certainly substantiate, among other things, an opinion recently expressed elsewhere in print by this editor. We do not believe that Henry J. Kaiser himself, or his son and successors in his "industrial empire," could ever have run a peanut stand successfully unless the United States Government furnished the capital and then bought the peanuts.

Yet Kaiser has been the "white-haired boy" of three successive socialist-slanted administrations — under Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. They have built up the Kaiser combine to look like a business, instead of a receiving trough for government handouts. In return, time after time a Kaiser has carried the ball around left end for the "liberal team," while posing as a member of the "free enterprise team"—as Edgar did once again in the recent steel strike. But the Government has had to pour hundreds of millions of dollars of your tax money and mine down the Kaiser drain just to keep the Kaiser "enterprises" alive, so that their head could pose as a businessman and even be in a position to betray his "fellow steel manufacturers."

In 1953 there was a Congressional investigation of the Air Force's contracts with Kaiser. It was made by the Preparedness Subcommittee No. 1, of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate. As a result of this investigation the subcommittee charged: (1) that the contracts between Kaiser and the Air Force had been "arranged" by John McCone, Under Secretary of the Air Force, although McCone had formerly been associated with Kaiser in shipbuilding during World War II, and was President of Bechtel-McCone Corporation in which Bechtel was a large Kaiser stockholder (John McCone is today Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Kaiser companies are, according to McCone himself, "important atomic energy contractors." As my friends in Brooklyn would say—

If You Want It Straight

it figures.); (2) that Kaiser firms had received over 6½ billion dollars in Government contracts, over 219 million dollars in RFC loans, and 409 million dollars in tax amortizations; (3) that the Air Force was paying Kaiser \$1,339,140 each for the same C-119 aircraft being bought from Fairchild for \$265,067; (4) that Kaiser had "improperly allocated" thirty-five percent of its costs of manufacturing automobiles to its Government contracts (in one instance \$4,200,000 had been "improperly allocated"); (5) that although Chase Aircraft Company had satisfactorily test-flown the C-123 plane in October, 1949, the Air Force had not ordered it into production until Chase let Kaiser buy forty-nine percent of its stock, nearly two years later, and that production had then been ordered the very next day after this merger; (6) that during the next two years the Air Force paid Kaiser millions of dollars to build 150 of the C-123 planes, but at the end of the two years not one plane had been built.

Become A National Disgrace

Did these disclosures by the Senate subcommittee put an end to the Kaiser climb? Not on your life. They didn't even slow it down. It's true that this investigation, and the *temporary* public pressure which resulted, caused the Air Force, in June, 1953, to cancel Kaiser's defaulted contracts. But the Air Force did so, not for Kaiser's failure to produce planes, but "for Government convenience." Then they paid, within 2½ months of the time submitted, Kaiser's claim of *over eighty-three million dollars*, for his costs on this terminated contract on which not one plane had been delivered. And of course the "Kaiser interests," going right on getting new government contracts and new government money on the same scale as before, have become even more favored pets of this administration than they were of Roosevelt and Truman. The only reason we have gone back to 1953 for facts to illustrate our point is that it was so much easier to take those already gathered by the

If You Want It Straight

Senate subcommittee. It is not because leopards have started changing their spots.

* * *

Which Is All Part Of A Program

And the point itself is not to be overlooked, or forgotten in a passing contempt for Edgar Kaiser. More important than the billions wasted with such abandon by the Defense Department, more important than the liquidation of small industries, is the unceasing drive to make all businesses look to government for its favors, fear government for its disfavor, and bow to the unchecked power of government to subsidize or to destroy.

For this drive is constantly and extensively at work through many means besides the contract placement and payment policies of Government procurement agencies. More and more is the impact of massive taxation a matter of interpretation and a weapon of discrimination — as in amortization rulings, the determination of what advertising is a “legitimate” expense, and a hundred other discretionary decisions — whereby the ideologically correct may be rewarded and the recalcitrant punished. More and more are a dozen such agencies as the Federal Communications Commission able to make or break business firms, depending on whether the management is “progressive” or “reactionary.” There are tens of thousands of business men in America today, who have never been within reaching distance of a government contract, who still are not quite willing to admit even to themselves the extent to which they softpedal some of their views to avoid becoming marked as opponents of an omnipresent “liberal” bureaucracy. Fighting and cursing the government was once a healthy and quite general American pastime, which was good for both the citizen and the government itself. That manifestation of independence has given way, to an attitude of fearing to offend government lest some agency swoop down upon us — some agency that is a law unto itself — and of begging government for its smiles. And you can

If You Want It Straight

be sure it has all been planned that way, despite the complete ignorance of a vast majority of government agents as to how they fit into an overall socialist design.

To Bring Business To Its Knees

Recently we had a most dramatic new move in that direction by the newest and probably most Communist-infested of all the Government departments. Mr. Arthur Flemming, of *Health, Education and Welfare*, picked on an industry that was entirely too small to fight back, but one whose products made the action taken one of excited interest to the whole American public, in order to prove to the public and to industry the life-or-death power which Government can now exert, at will and without warning, over all American business enterprises. And anybody who would expect anything else of Arthur Flemming simply has not studied his history.

Of course, once the damage had been done and the arbitrary power had been proved, a smokescreen was thrown up to shut off some of the resentment. Mr. Flemming brilliantly disarmed many of his most severe but most easily befuddled critics by tying his devastatingly timed attack on the cranberry industry to a general ban on extraneous chemicals in foods. The reaction was much the same in some quarters as it would have been if Mao Tse-tung had suddenly joined the Young Men's Christian Association.

Let's quickly clarify the issues. Every conservative we know is bitterly opposed to the addition of fluoride to our water, to the use of stilbestrol to make chickens grow faster and fatter, and to any similar use of poisons, stimulants, or adulterants to change the natural quality of what we eat and drink. While we would all prefer a society in which the power of honest advertising, the appeal of commercial integrity, and the enlightened operation of *caveat emptor*, would make it unprofitable for the hurry-up artists with shoddy merchandise to try to sell their artificially stimulated meats or vegetables, we

If You Want It Straight

realize that the dependence of the American people on government to protect them from their own folly has already gone too far to allow free-market forces room to operate with necessary effectiveness in such circumstances.

Being sorrowfully realistic, therefore, many of us would welcome a Government prohibition on such outrageous tampering with our foods as the injection of diethylstilbestrol or any other estrogen, especially if the ruling were brought forth by the Food and Drug Administration. For FDA is not only the proper governmental authority for any such action — which HEW is not — but FDA is an old-line agency which, through age and experience, has acquired a certain respectability and a reputation for reasonableness and sanity. We could have some confidence that rulings of this nature by "Food and Drug" were at least made for the purpose claimed — namely, to protect the public — rather than to see how much damage could be inflicted on the businesses involved.

Even At The Feet Of An Arthur Flemming

But the action of Arthur Flemming with regard to cranberries should not be given the benefit of any such considerations, despite his belated attempt to raise that umbrella over it. Both the timing and the utter lack of any discrimination between "good" berries and "bad" berries exposed a destructiveness of purpose that could not be ascribed to mere irresponsibility. When to that was added the authoritative disclosure from other sources that a man would have to eat thousands of pounds of the cranberries per day, to be affected in the slightest by the residue of weed killer which the berries had absorbed, the whole operation showed up as a phoney grandstand play. It was nothing more nor less than an arbitrary and slaphappy exercise of government power, by one of the most left-wing bureaucrats in our whole government, to impress business and the public and other bureaucrats with the reach and magnitude of that power.

If You Want It Straight

If you doubt the accuracy of this analysis, let us suggest a simple test whereby you can draw your own conclusion. There is no question but that fluoride is a deadly poison. There is no question but that the fluoridation of any public water supply subjects the members of the community to a tremendously greater risk of deleterious effort than would the daily eating of pounds of cranberries from bushes which had been sprayed with aminotriazole. Nobody has to eat cranberries if he doesn't want to do so, but with a fluoridated public water supply it will be almost impossible, as a practical matter, for anybody to avoid getting that fluoridated water frequently, in something that he eats or drinks. It would seem clear that anybody who objects to *all* adulterants, stimulants, extraneous chemicals, and contaminants in our food — even to the incredibly extreme extent indicated in "operation cranberry" — would be vigorously opposed to fluoridation of water. But the Left Wing wants public water fluoridation everywhere, for reasons of its own. And when you find Arthur Flemming opposing fluoridation, or even failing actively to support fluoridation, we'll admit we are wrong and apologize for everything we have said. But don't hold your breath waiting for it to happen.

THE PRACTICAL TOVARICH

Mr. George Allen has been telling this anecdote. During the American Fair in Moscow, in a book in which the Soviet visitors were invited to write their comments, someone had written in bold letters: "The Soviet Union will catch the United States." Someone else wrote in equally bold letters: "The Soviet Union will catch the United States and will pass the United States." A third party wrote: "The Soviet Union will catch the United States and will pass the United States, and as it passes I want to get off."

CONFETTI

Last fall in London, England, an art exhibition official named Francis Cooper praised one entry for "its nice texture and simple design." He had "no comment" the next day, on being told that it was a typist's inky stencil which someone had submitted as a joke.

The district attorney was questioning a Kentucky Colonel in court. Unable to shake the witness' testimony, he tried sarcasm. "They call you Colonel," he sneered. "In what regiment are you a Colonel?"

"Well, it's like this," drawled the witness. "The 'Colonel' in front of my name is like the 'Honorable' in front of yours. It doesn't mean a thing."

The Texas rancher, visiting Australia was being shown around the largest farm in New South Wales.

"Why this would fit in one corner of my ranch back in Texas," he said.

When his friend pointed to a herd of ten thousand cattle, the Texan said: "Yeah, they're purty, but the whole lot could get lost in my herd."

Just then a kangaroo leaped squarely over them both.

"What in tarnation is that?" the startled Texan asked.

"Why, for goodness sake," the Australian replied, "do you mean to tell me you don't have grasshoppers in Texas?"

A man whose wife had recently learned to drive was dumbfounded, on returning home one evening, to find the family automobile in the living room.

"How in the world did you land our car in here?" he asked.

"Nothing to it," she replied. "When I got to the kitchen, I simply made a left turn."

Cannibal to witch doctor: "Something's wrong with my kid. He won't eat anybody."

Joey Bishop, in *Parade*, tells of the German refugee who, getting off the train in Chicago, approached a porter and asked: "Was sagst du?"

The porter replied: "They're leading four to three in the ninth inning."

"Yes, I'll give you a job. Sweep out the store."

"But I'm a college graduate."

"Okay, I'll show you how."

A traveler, just returned from Europe, was asked if he had seen much poverty.

"Not too much," he replied. "But I brought plenty of it back with me."

Librarian: "I hope you found the novel interesting."

Patron: "No, not very. But the letter my neighbor left in it for a bookmark certainly was."

A confirmed drunkard had at long last been cured of the bottle and his psychiatrist was about to test him to see if the cure was complete. "Now, then," he said, "what does the name Gordon convey to you?"

The ex-drunkard thought. "Wasn't that the name of a famous general?" he said.

"Very good, said the psychiatrist. "And what does the name Haig mean?"

"He was a noted Earl," was the reply.

"Excellent," said the psychiatrist. "And now for the supreme test. What does Vat 69 mean to you?"

The man sat deep in thought. At last he looked up and asked: "Isn't that the Pope's telephone number?"

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

by

REVILO P. OLIVER

IF, DURING THE HOURS OF DAYLIGHT, you walk into any building devoted to public education, the chances are that you will find in some room a committee of solemn-faced homunculi earnestly discussing a question of the type, "Should mashed potatoes be eaten with a monkey-wrench or a light bulb?" And if you listen to their deliberations, you will witness an application of the most important discovery made by our professional "educators." If a question is put in terms which exclude common sense, there is automatically created a "problem" about which an unlimited number of expert nincompoops can gabble for an unlimited time and produce unlimited confusion. This, you must agree, is an economic discovery of no mean order.

For centuries children were quickly and easily taught to read, either at home or in primary schools, and everyone knew that for so simple a task all that was needed was a little literacy, a little common sense, and a fair amount of patience. But practitioners of the "science of education," as soon as they had set themselves up in business, began to apply their epoch-making and job-making discovery, and, with the aid of an outlandish jargon, specially devised to conceal the essential absurdity of their "problems," they speedily converted the simple and obvious into a dark and hieratic mystery accessible only to a specialized priesthood ordained with the degree of "Doctor of Education in

Reading." And these experts, going to work on our schools with the enthusiasm of a swarm of locusts newly arrived in a field of ripe wheat, are making such progress that we are rapidly becoming a nation of illiterate blockheads. Johnny can't read, but he can be so "well adjusted" that he won't know the difference.

Since 1947 in the public schools of New Castle, Pennsylvania, children have been taught to read by Mr. Glenn McCracken, the author of *The Right to Learn* (Henry Regnery, Chicago; 248 pages, \$4.50). A very large part of the book is devoted to shovelling away the mounds of gibberish and befuddlement deposited by two generations of "experts," and in doing this Mr. McCracken, who hopes, not unreasonably, to enlist the coöperation of all professional pedagogues who really mean well, writes with careful moderation and tact. He even describes his success in New Castle as the result of an "experiment" with a "new method." But—to his honor be it noted—the method, aside from a few details, such as the employment of film-strips, is a revival of what was once obvious; its novelty—its great novelty lies in a courageous return to common sense.

Like Rudolph Flesch's now famous *Why Johnny Can't Read*, this book belongs in the hands of parents concerned for the welfare of their children and country, whether they hope to reform the public schools of their community

A Review Of Reviews

or plan to establish private schools to deliver at least their own offspring from the hands of the professional mind-destroyers.

Mr. McCracken's experience has convinced him that all children not mentally defective can be taught to read within the time that was normally allotted to this function in the old-fashioned elementary school. Now nothing can be more obvious than the fact that men are not created equal, and every educational system, if it is not to be a blight upon civilization, must effectively encourage natural superiority at an early age, but the results obtained at New Castle indicate that many of us have seriously overestimated the percentage of morons in our population, and that our error was partly induced by educational bandits who were (as we should have expected) trying to cover their tracks with fake statistics.

* * *

Mr. McCracken is undoubtedly right when he says, "In any work of reconstruction, the builders must start with the foundations . . . Until we reform the present system of teaching our children to read, we will not have made any secure educational reform whatever." But the locusts have been at work in the high schools not only to perpetuate systematic illiteracy, but also to induce the mental and moral paralysis that produces good livestock for the Hellfare State.

A journalist, sixteen college professors, and a member of a board of education have collaborated to produce *The Case for Basic Education*, edited by James D. Koerner (Little-Brown, Boston; 269 pages, \$4.00). The book, sponsored by the Council for Basic Education, is based on the premise, which

will seem novel to many of our contemporaries and terrifying to almost all of our "educators," that the function of a high school is to provide an opportunity for a high-school education.

The sixteen professors, each writing about his own field, have covered all the subjects that have a place in a high-school curriculum, and have, of course, ignored the many varieties of trash and garbage that the "educators" have imported for the purpose of crowding out those subjects. It is a minor defect of the book that it does not make it quite clear that admission to a high school should be contingent upon a reasonable proficiency in English grammar, that most of geography and a large part of American history belong in the elementary school, and that it might be well to begin either French or Latin before the ninth grade. With these and one or two minor reservations, the writers have all adequately, and many of them admirably, stated what a high-school student should learn in the various areas of basic education.

The real force and unity of the book, however, lies in the brief introduction by Clifton Fadiman, who never attended a college and is obviously far better educated than most of the college presidents who are now out peddling their shoddy wares and screaming for more Federal Aid. Mr. Fadiman, who claims to have been a mediocre pupil, points out that the standard curriculum in the mediocre high school in a poor district of New York City which he attended from 1916 to 1920 gave him a basic education, with only one deficiency. ("Unfortunately Latin was not compulsory: I had to learn it . . . by myself later on.") It was basic because "(1) It furnished me with a foundation on

A Review Of Reviews

which later on, within the limits of my abilities, I could erect any intellectual structure I fancied . . . (2) It precluded my ever becoming Lost . . . I know . . . what large general movements of history produced me; what my capacities and limitations are; what truly interests me; and how valuable or valueless these interests are."

Mr. Fadiman sees clearly that the issue in the schools today is one on which there can be no compromise. You cannot combine the old Hellenic-Humanist faith that "man's nature is both animal *and* rational" with the Marxist-Freudian-Pragmatist determination to make man's nature exclusively animal. And a clear choice between the two imposes itself on a nation that is at last becoming aware that it is being destroyed, intellectually and morally, by its schools.

* * *

The choice must include our colleges. When in New York a typical "Liberal intellectual," Charles Van Doren, was caught in an act of academic prostitution that, given the size of the pay-off, was not quite typical, several colleges offered him a job in the hope that they could cash in on the publicity, and 650 students in Columbia protested on his behalf. "What?" said they, in effect, "Hasn't an intellectual the right to bamboozle the boobs for a fast buck? What's a college education for, anyway?" But the demonstration had the effect of focusing national attention on what had previously been an unmentionable aspect of "higher" education. Even the New York *Times* carried an article in which Hans J. Morgenthau pointed out that a society which refuses to condemn Van Doren "cannot but condemn itself. For it con-

victs itself of a moral obtuseness which signifies the beginning of the end of civilized society."

At the other extremity of the continent, however, there was a rift in moral obtuseness which may be significant. Mr. Edward McDevitt, an undergraduate writing in the University of Washington's *Daily*, accurately diagnosed the prevailing condition of college teaching: "The experienced man before the class knows full well that the majority of his students are doing little more than passing time, and will . . . accept as Truth almost anything he chooses to promulgate." And the "Liberal intellectual," made secure by this intellectual apathy, "will go on spreading the distortions, the half-truths, the outright lies of the Liberal Establishment. He will, that is, until more students wake up to what is happening to them, and recognize the subtle brain-washing for what it is."

More and more of the generation now lost in our academic slough of despond are discovering the steep path that leads Up from Liberalism.

* * *

The great symbol of "Liberalism," the hypnotic figure carefully built up from thousands of well coördinated lies, is Franklin Delano Roosevelt. So long as the image of this Dagon remains upright to excite the veneration of the sentimental and the greedy, the curse that is upon us will remain unbroken. We need to destroy this malefic symbol, but we need also to determine, coldly and objectively, just what Roosevelt really was. Only thus can we understand the catastrophe in which we still live.

The first comprehensive portrait was John T. Flynn's *The Roosevelt Myth*

A Review Of Reviews

(Devin-Adair, New York, 1948, revised 1956; \$3.95). This was followed by three fundamental studies of phases of an almost incredible career, and now we have a fourth, which is in many ways the most timely and revealing of all. *Roosevelt's Road to Russia*, by George N. Crocker (Henry Regnery, Chicago; 329 pages, \$5.00), is a carefully documented and lucidly written account of facts that speak for themselves with such implacable eloquence that this book should be in the hands of every thoughtful and honest American who is still under the spell of the illusion created by a superb actor and ten thousand unprincipled liars. For this book will leave no doubt in any open mind, however uninformed it may be about Roosevelt's other actions, but that Roosevelt deliberately forced the United States and Great Britain to fight a war to impose Communist tyranny on a devastated and brutalized world.

Now, as Mr. Crocker is careful to point out, this does not mean that Roosevelt was a Communist; it means that he did everything in his great power to promote the international conspiracy. The distinction is a very important one for an understanding of his character.

The great actor was never able to conceal his own personality from judicious observers who had an opportunity to know him well. Long before the Democratic convention in 1932, William Randolph Hearst recognized in Roosevelt a scoundrel "unworthy of public or private trust." By 1941, at least, administrative circles in Washington were circulating the epigram, "Führer Frankie's only moral principle is never to speak the truth." And the experience of his most loyal supporters (except Communists) is summarized

in John Flynn's statement, "He betrayed all who trusted him."

One frequently hears Roosevelt described as an egomaniac, a psychopath, a diseased mind in a diseased body. But we must be careful in the use of such terms. There is no indication that his power of reasoning was ever affected. (His apologists make much of the fact that he was ill at the time of the great betrayal at Yalta, but Mr. Crocker shows that Yalta merely carried out a program that "was down in black and white as early as the First Quebec Conference in 1943," and that this in turn was the expression of a policy consistently followed from the very beginning of the war.)

Roosevelt's mind was incapable of philosophic thought, but it must have been shrewd and subtle, if he was responsible for the direction of his own career. Until he died, he unfailingly obtained everything that he wanted, manifesting cunning and guile unsurpassed in human history. When, for example, the few remaining details of the procedure whereby the Japanese were induced to destroy the American fleet at Pearl Harbor come to light, we shall doubtless be obliged to admire the thoroughness of a planner who left nothing to chance; and if a congressional committee should ever have the courage to summon Tyler Kent before it, we should probably discover that some of the shrewdest statesmen in Europe had been outwitted and cozened before they precipitated in 1939 the war that Roosevelt so ardently desired.

The great evil that Roosevelt wrought must have been directed by an intelligence endowed with extraordinary powers of logic and intuition. The only question is whether that intelligence

A Review Of Reviews

was Roosevelt's or was provided by a gang of advisers, including the reptilian Harry Hopkins and the unspeakable Alger Hiss. On the latter hypothesis, Roosevelt was merely a talented actor who recited lines and made gestures determined by unseen directors offstage, and gratified his histrionic vanity by playing the rôles devised for him by the Communist conspiracy. The alternative hypothesis is supported by the opinion of the Swiss psychiatrist, Carl Jung, who was a man of considerable penetration and after an interview with Roosevelt in 1936 described him as "a man of superior and impenetrable mind, but *perfectly* ruthless . . . He has the most amazing power complex, . . . the stuff of a dictator absolutely." Such a man would have allied himself with the Communists to use their great lie-machine and criminal apparatus to destroy the mind and pervert the will of the American people as a means of attaining the unlimited tyranny that he undoubtedly coveted, and could have planned the war that procured the Soviet triumph for the purpose of assuring himself an opportunity for another war and even more fun.

Mr. Crocker, certainly in accord with the weight of the evidence *now* available, believes that it was Roosevelt who made the decisions. But he has occasionally attenuated his references to Roosevelt's motives in a way inconsistent with this interpretation.

Mr. Crocker shows, beyond peradventure of doubt, that Roosevelt knew that the war was being conducted to make the Soviet Union the dominant power in Europe, at least, and that it "is not open to question" that he "embraced this concept with complete

equanimity." He shows that Roosevelt, time after time, knowing full well what American interests required, "secretly did the opposite." He shows that Roosevelt throughout the war knowingly and deliberately betrayed the United States (and Great Britain) to serve the Soviet Union. But here and there—perhaps to temper the winds of truth to the lambs that have been shorn by almost three decades of concerted lying—he inserts such gratuitous remarks as "Roosevelt no doubt persuaded himself that he accomplished something good at Teheran" or "Roosevelt . . . cherished an implacable fixation that the Bolsheviks who ruled Russia were men of good will." There is no evidence whatsoever to warrant this extravagant kindness. There is no evidence that Roosevelt ever thought of good for anyone but himself.

All the evidence indicates that Roosevelt was completely devoid of certain elements that we like to regard as necessary parts of human nature: conscience, compassion, moral sense. *Nothing* had value for him except his own satisfaction. He could devise and procure the death of a million human beings with no more compunction than a child feels when it knocks over a toy soldier with a pop-gun. For him, men were worms to be trodden on or impaled on a hook to gratify his slightest whim. He belongs to a species that, much as we dislike to admit it, is not infrequently found. From time to time our newspapers record the capture of young beasts who shoot men in the belly "just to see them kick" or dynamite an airliner to collect the insurance they have taken out on their mother, and even hardened police remark with wonder that these creatures have no sense of

A Review Of Reviews

having done anything wrong. More intelligent specimens appear in history, from Hulagu, who amused himself with the construction of pyramids of human heads, to Xerxes, who rewarded his greatest benefactor by capriciously having the man's son torn limb from limb in his presence. This is, of course, the species that is represented by Trotsky, Stalin, Khrushchev, and all the true Communists. And to this species Roosevelt undoubtedly belonged. Behind the benignly grinning idol so carefully constructed by Liberal-Communist propaganda, we find not a madman, but a monster—a perfectly lucid and rational monster.

When we consider this species of anatomically human beings, we seem to be peering into a primeval abyss of obscene and incredible evil, and our eyes, sickened, wish to turn away, but that abyss is the most important fact in our world today.

* * *

An essential part of Roosevelt's plan of despotism was the destruction of the American economic system to make all business dependent on governmental decree. Hence the series of measures which forbade his subjects to possess gold, debased the currency, initiated progressive inflation, and eventually closed our gold mines and shipped their machinery to Russia.

This operation and its consequences are concisely described by George Racey Jordan in *Gold Swindle* (Bookmailer, New York; 100 pages, \$1.25.) The book contains extracts from congressional hearings, including one conducted by Senator Malone before money from mysterious sources was poured into Nevada to defeat him in 1958.

Major Jordan points out that "Foreign

Aid" and other international dissipation of our resources have alienated most of the gold in Fort Knox and have reduced our reserves to less than one-twentieth of the minimum legal backing for our currency. (This estimate, by the way, is more optimistic than that given in the issue of *U. S. News and World Report* for 30 November.) We are on the verge of a financial collapse paralleled only by what happened in Germany after the First World War. The panic has not yet started, but it will take prompt and drastic action to save us.

* * *

We conservatives are now engaged in a desperate struggle against gigantically organized forces of evil. Our numbers are growing, and more and more of us are coming to realize that the crisis demands nothing less than the total dedication of ourselves. But the time is so short! And what if we fail?

A brilliant attempt to answer that question is *The John Franklin Letters* (Bookmailer, New York; 178 pages, cloth \$2.00). The book, in the form of a collection of letters ostensibly written between 1957 and 1976 by an ordinary American of conservative preceptions, is at once a logical projection of the present curve of American life into the future and a story of exciting suspense, comparable, indeed, to a novel by Eric Ambler, but more vivid because every reader will feel himself directly involved in it. I shall not, therefore, hint at its plot or discuss the points at which the vectors of certain forces now in operation may not have been accurately measured in the projection. I shall only promise the reader an unforgettable story, which incidentally conveys information about techniques of survival that he may need to know someday soon.

A Review Of The News

*This is a magazine of opinion. But opinion should
be based on facts. Here are the facts for*

NOVEMBER, 1959

Sunday, November 1

→ Prime Minister Nehru says that India is making "adequate military preparations to meet the challenge of aggression by the Chinese Communists."

→ The Soviet Government declares it intends to build all three stages of the Aswan High Dam on the Nile.

→ The United States Navy asks for three times the amount budgeted this year for the development of Polaris missile submarines.

→ Premier Abdul Karim el-Kassem asserts Iraq will not tolerate interference "from any other Arab country."

→ A National Planning Association study predicts the Soviet Union will be able in 1965 to spend more than the United States on developing economic power.

Monday, November 2

→ The Cuban Government of Fidel Castro seizes seventy-five thousand acres of agricultural and mineral land owned by United States corporations.

→ The Soviet Government is reported to be sending shipments of meat to Communist Poland to help cope with shortages there.

→ The United Nations' Political Committee endorses unanimously the Khrushchev proposal for "general disarmament."

→ N.B.C.'s Professor Charles van Doren confesses that his television quiz appearances, at which he had won \$129,000, were "fixed."

Tuesday, November 3

→ President Eisenhower announces he will visit several countries in Europe, the Middle East and Asia in December before the four-power Western "summit meeting" in Paris.

→ The United States Government discloses it is selling 200,000 tons of fodder grains "on long-term conditions" to Communist Poland to help in overcoming its meat shortage.

→ Mobs attempt to invade the Canal Zone in Panama in anti-American demonstrations.

→ Premier David Ben-Gurion's Mapai Party wins the Israeli elections.

→ Harold Stassen loses the Philadelphia mayoralty elections to the Democrats in a two-to-one landslide.

→ Mayor Wagner's proposal for a 500-million-dollars school bond amendment is turned down by New York's voters.

→ The United States Government declares it will not tolerate attempts to set up an anti-Castro Cuban "government-in-exile" in the United States.

Wednesday, November 4

→ The French Government of Charles

A Review Of The News

de Gaulle announces it remains determined to hold a nuclear test explosion in the Sahara desert unless all powers "renounce their nuclear armament."

→ The Government of Panama rejects a United States note of protest against the recent mob attacks on the United States Embassy and presents a note of "counter protest."

→ A military attaché of the Red Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington quits and asks for political asylum in the United States.

Thursday, November 5

→ NATO's Secretary General Paul-Henri Spaak demands that the Western Big Four hear the views of all smaller members of the Western Alliance on a "summit meeting."

→ India's Prime Minister Nehru rules out the possibility of a "real war" with Red China.

→ British Labor leader Philip J. Noel-Baker is awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

→ The United States automobile industry has laid off more than 200,000 automobile workers in consequence of strike-caused steel shortages.

→ New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan asserts that of 150 persons who testified before the grand jury on television quiz-show rigging "maybe fifty told the truth."

Friday, November 6

→ The United Nations' "inquiry group" sent to Laos declares it has found no clear proof to support charges that the Communist North-Vietnamese

forces have committed "flagrant aggression."

→ General Maxwell D. Taylor, recently resigned Army Chief of Staff, sharply attacks, in a book, the Administration's military and strategic policies.

→ The Colombo Plan Conference announces that "underdeveloped nations" in South and Southeast Asia received last year more than a billion dollars aid, mostly from the United States.

→ The Government of Panama submits another "counter protest" note in Washington.

→ Assistant Secretary of State Walter C. Dowling is selected to succeed David K. E. Bruce as United States Ambassador to West Germany.

Saturday, November 7

→ The Supreme Court, by a vote of eight to one, upholds a Taft-Hartley injunction to halt the nation-wide steel strike.

→ Former President Harry S. Truman bids the United States cancel "our self-imposed ban on nuclear tests."

→ The United States Air Force warns that the new budget "guidelines" proposed by the administration for the military services might force a substantial cut in strategic air power.

Sunday, November 8

→ Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev declares that the frontier area over which India and Red China are feuding "is unpopulated and of no strategic significance."

→ Columbia University announces an

A Review Of The News

agreement for an exchange of professors with Moscow University.

→ A.F. of L.-C.I.O. leadership asks Governor Rockefeller of New York to seek a \$1.50 an-hour minimum wage by State legislation.

Monday, November 9

→ Premier Chou En-lai of Red China proposes a mutual withdrawal by Indian and Chinese troops in the two countries' border zone.

→ Secretary of State Christian A. Herter asserts that all NATO members will be consulted before and after the Western Big Four "summit meeting."

→ The Soviet delegation in the United Nations warns that France's determination to execute atomic tests in the Sahara "could jeopardize the present improvement of East-West relations."

→ The Italian Government notifies the Soviet Government that it does not want Soviet Premier Khrushchev to return President Gronchi's forthcoming visit to Moscow.

→ Walter P. Reuther declares the American labor movement is getting flabby and is going backward.

Tuesday, November 10

→ President Charles de Gaulle announces that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev will arrive in Paris on March 15 for his state visit to France.

→ Prime Minister Nehru declares that Indians "cannot allow China to keep a foot on her chest."

→ Officials of the State Department announce the United States Govern-

ment has proof that the Panamanian Government ordered the police not to interfere with the anti-American mob demonstrations.

→ General Motors' last two assembly lines are to be closed down halting all passenger-car production by the company.

Wednesday, November 11

→ Prime Minister Nehru, in a note sent to his key ambassadors abroad, declares he fears force will be required to eject Red Chinese troops from invaded Indian territory.

→ The Soviet Government sends a protest note to the Western Powers against alleged propaganda efforts of the Bonn Government in West Berlin.

→ The Moscow radio broadcasts strong pro-Castro, anti-American talks.

Thursday, November 12

→ Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declares that the United States "has no firm position on the border dispute between India and Communist China."

→ Vice President Richard M. Nixon asserts that "anyone urging a resumption of nuclear weapon testing is ignorant of the facts."

→ The Gomulka Government of Communist Poland expels the *New York Times* correspondent in Warsaw, A. M. Rosenthal, for "exposing too deeply the internal situation in Poland."

→ Admiral Jerauld Wright, commander of all Western military forces in the Atlantic, warns that the threat from the Soviets is "at least as great as it was ten years ago."

A Review Of The News

Friday, November 13

→ Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, warns it is important to take the Soviet economic claims and ambitions seriously.

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev praises Indian Prime Minister Nehru as an "outstanding statesman."

→ Fidel Castro's Government rejects in vehement language an official United States protest against "deliberate and concerted (anti-American) efforts" in Cuba.

→ The Red Chinese Government starts "redistributing" land owned by monasteries in occupied Tibet.

→ A Brazilian trade mission goes to Moscow to test the Soviet Union's ability "to absorb Latin-American surpluses of raw materials and provide capital goods."

Saturday, November 14

→ Embittered disagreements over Algerian policies show at the Bordeaux convention of Charles de Gaulle's Union for the New Republic, with Jacques Soustelle holding the balance of power between de Gaulle and his rightist opposition.

→ High Army officials are "outraged" by a Budget Bureau's proposal to bring back from overseas at least two United States divisions.

→ Statements of Italian President Gronchi are interpreted as a threat to repeal the concordat as a reprisal for the Vatican's opposition to his forthcoming Moscow visit.

→ Informed United States sources ex-

press their concern over a fast deterioration of relations between Brazil and the United States.

Sunday, November 15

→ President Eisenhower insists that Air Force and Navy be cut five thousand men each.

→ Secretary of State Herter expresses his belief that the United States and the Soviet Union will find "a common language" for the "ground rules of survival in the atomic age."

→ By creating eight new Cardinals, two of them Americans, Pope John XXIII raises the membership of the Sacred College to seventy-nine, the largest ever.

Monday, November 16

→ Chancellor Adenauer meets with Harold Macmillan in London in an attempt to reduce the British-German tensions over the "summit conference."

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev declares in Moscow that one factory in the Soviet Union produces rockets with hydrogen-bomb warheads at an annual rate of 250.

→ Bonn officials express their "deep concern" over stated United States intentions to reduce the size of United States Army contingents in Western Europe.

→ Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan arrives in Canada on his way to an extended "visit" in Mexico.

→ A West German newsman, Harry Pohl, is expelled from Finland for anti-Communist research and reporting.

A Review Of The News

→ The German Social Democratic Party adopts a program that renounces some economic dogmas of Marxism.

Tuesday, November 17

→ The head of the Soviet Atomic Energy Program, Vasily S. Yemelyanov, proposes that the Soviet Union and the United States join in, and share the burden of, developing nuclear power.

→ The Soviet Government declares it is confident that the "summit conferences" will lead eventually to the conclusion of a German peace treaty along the lines prescribed by the Kremlin.

→ France doubles its budgetary expenses for the development of atomic weapons.

Wednesday, November 18

→ Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, warns that talks with the Soviet Union, on the basis of terms now being considered by the Administration, can represent a major defeat for the West.

→ Adenauer declares in London that his suspicions, that Britain supports plans for military disengagement in Central Europe, "have been abandoned."

→ A Congressional subcommittee releases testimony which asserts that a hundred-million-dollar Communist propaganda program is at work to spread anti-American feelings in Latin America.

→ Yale and Harvard Universities drop out of the Federal Student Loan Program because they oppose the loyalty oath that it requires from student applicants.

→ Livingston T. Merchant, Deputy Undersecretary of State, is dispatched to Panama to discuss with the Panamanian Government the issues underlying recent incidents.

Thursday, November 19

→ At the conclusion of his conferences with Harold Macmillan in London, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer concedes his readiness to negotiate an "interim settlement for West Berlin at the "summit meeting."

→ Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba announces that all property "of counter-revolutionists" will be confiscated.

→ In a move directed against the declared intentions of the French Government, the Political Committee of the United Nations' General Assembly votes unanimously with two abstentions (France and Afghanistan) that all nations refrain from nuclear tests.

→ Mexican President Lopez Mateos accepts a Soviet invitation to visit Moscow.

→ Budget Director Maurice H. Stans announces that he anticipates a deficit in the current budget year ending June 30.

Friday, November 20

→ The Algerian "Government-in-Exile" names five rebel chieftains, captives of the French since October 1956, as "peace negotiators" with Charles de Gaulle.

→ The United Nations' General Assembly, by a vote of fifty-one to sixteen (with fifteen abstentions) expresses its "grave concern" over the intended French nuclear test in the Sahara.

A Review Of The News

→ The heads of the Soviet and the United States atomic agencies announce an agreement "in principle" on a cooperative program of nuclear research.

→ Europe's "Outer Seven" (Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria and Portugal) form a limited free trade area to cooperate with the "Common Market Six" (West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg).

→ The State Department denies that Milton S. Eisenhower has made a statement committing the United States in 1958 to recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

→ Moscow newspapers praise Secretary Herter for his recent statements on the prospects of United States negotiations with the Soviet Union.

→ Cuba's National Labor Congress rejects Fidel Castro's admonition to elect Communists into the leadership and votes for a non-Communist slate of candidates.

Saturday, November 21

→ The Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States challenge the Soviet Union's avowal of "peaceful aims" and issue a stern warning against appeasement of World Communism.

→ The United States and the Soviet Union extend for two years an agreement "for scientific, technical, cultural, educational and sport exchanges."

→ According to responsible Allied military officials in West Germany, a "thinning" of United States air power in Western Europe is "likely."

→ A Soviet trade mission visiting Tokyo is seeking the purchase of 250 million dollars' worth of Japanese steel and machinery in 1960.

→ Yugoslav Foreign Minister Koca Popovic says in the Red "parliament" that Red Yugoslavia's relations with the Soviet Union and the satellites "are gradually developing and improving."

→ Fidel Castro asks for Mrs. Roosevelt's visit to Cuba "to help promote better understanding between the United States and Cuba."

Sunday, November 22

→ The Cuban Federation of Workers withdraws from the anti-Communist Inter-American Regional Organization of Labor, claiming it is "an agency of American imperialism."

→ Colonel Pawel Monat, one of Communist Poland's top intelligence agents, turns himself over to United States representatives.

→ John A. McCone, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, advocates that the United States suspension of nuclear tests should be extended on a week-to-week basis only.

→ A group of leading American economists warns that the United States rate of economic growth trails that of most major nations.

→ The Government of West Germany protests against a decision of the International Olympic Committee that suggests a special German flag for the Olympic Games 1960 in order to "appease" the Communist East German participants.

→ A Soviet delegation arrives in Lon-

A Review Of The News

don to negotiate "a program of cultural exchange with Britain."

Monday, November 23

→ By a vote of fifteen to three the Steering Committee of the United Nations' General Assembly recommends the addition of the "Hungarian question" to the Assembly's agenda.

→ Walter S. Robertson, United States delegate to the United Nations, declares the United Nations are duty-bound to insist on free elections in Communist North Korea.

→ French General Jean-Etienne Valluy, aid to NATO commander-in-chief, General Norstad, complains that some member states are not meeting their promised military contributions to NATO.

→ The Inter-American Press Association charges that there is "an increasing censorship by terror" in Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Tuesday, November 24

→ French press reports consider the possibility that the Western powers will suggest April 25 as date for the "summit conference" and that President de Gaulle will visit Washington around April 5.

→ Moscow's *Pravda* renews its praise for Secretary of State Christian A. Herter.

→ Marshal Tito's Communist press expresses its joy over the announced Belgrade visit of Austrian Foreign Minister Bruno Kreisky.

→ The United Arab Republic warns all international airplane companies to stop the transportation of immigrants

to Israel if those companies want to retain the friendship and cooperation of Arab nations.

Wednesday, November 25

→ President Eisenhower asserts that the risks of non-agreement on "disarmament" are "enormous" compared with the dangers of evasion involved in an arms pact.

→ Fidel Castro appoints Argentinian Communist Ernesto Guevara, one of the most rabidly anti-American members of his staff, president of the National Bank of Cuba.

→ Former United Nations diplomat Povl Bang-Jensen, who last year was dismissed by Secretary General Hammarkjoeld for keeping his word to anti-Communist Hungarian witnesses, is declared a suicide in spite of strong hints of foul play.

→ Dr. Choung Pyong Ok, former National Police Director of South Korea, is nominated as the Korean Democratic Party's candidate to oppose President Syngman Rhee in the election next spring.

Thursday, November 26

→ At the anniversary of Khrushchev's "Berlin Ultimatum" Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt asserts that the Western powers must not allow a change of West Berlin's present status.

→ The Bonn Government rejects the "flag compromise" by which the International Olympic Committee wants to commit West Germany to march with the sport delegation of Ulbricht's East Germany under a common synthetic flag.

A Review Of The News

→ Saragat's Italian Social Democratic Party begins its national convention that is to determine its position towards a Nenni-supported leftist government.

Friday, November 27.

→ Sir Leslie Munroe of New Zealand submits an official report to the United Nations on the aftermath of the suppressed Hungarian upheaval of 1956 and states that Hungarian patriots are still being tried and executed.

→ Indian Prime Minister Nehru extends to Nepal his pledge that India will protect neighboring states against aggression.

→ Officials of the Chinese Communist Consulate in Bombay, India, seize a United States consulate clerk and mistreat him during his illegal detention.

→ It is announced that Khrushchev will visit Budapest to endorse the Kadar regime.

→ Premier Michel Debré's French Government wins a vote of confidence amidst a growing opposition in the Paris Chamber of Deputies.

→ Thousands of Communist-led students and workers fight with police in anti-American mass demonstrations in Tokyo, leaving five hundred wounded.

Saturday, November 28

→ On the eve of his departure for a visit to a Parisian conference with President Charles de Gaulle, Konrad Adenauer declares that to secure German-French cooperation is the task of his life.

→ A new wave of strikes alarms Paris.

→ Hugh Gaitskill, the leader of the British Labor Party, asserts at the party's national convention that it must develop from a class to a "popular" party.

→ Pope John XXIII gives the Kongo and Ruanda-Urundi in East Africa, till now considered "missionary territories," the "self-rule" status of bishoprics.

Sunday, November 29

→ Communist China, accusing the United States, charges that one of its General Consulate staff members in Bombay was "kidnaped" and held in detention for twenty hours.

→ Wild anti-American demonstrations, trying to force their way into the United States-controlled Canal Zone in Panama, are beaten back by troops.

→ Prime Minister Nehru calls on Indians "to be prepared for war if it becomes inevitable."

→ The Commerce Department announces that foreign nations received from the United States, in the fiscal year of 1959, 4.5 billion dollars in gifts and loans.

Monday, November 30

→ Adenauer declares that a "status quo" in Europe is not acceptable to either the West Germans or the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe.

→ The leader of Hungarian Communism, Janos Kadar, declares in Khrushchev's presence that Soviet troops will continue to stay in Hungary.

A Review Of The News

→ The national convention of Saragat's Social Democrats in Rome decides on a policy that increases the chances of a Nenni-supported leftist government in Italy.

→ President Eisenhower asks Congress for 4.1 billion dollars in foreign aid in 1960/61 as compared with 3.2 billion dollars Congress appropriated in the preceding year.

DECEMBER, 1959

Tuesday, December 1

→ On arriving in Paris for conferences with Charles de Gaulle, Dr. Adenauer defends the principle of NATO military integration against de Gaulle's attacks.

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev asserts the Soviet Union has enough rockets to destroy all its foes and declares world disarmament must be solved along with the Berlin question.

→ Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Deputy Secretary of Defense, is appointed Defense Secretary to succeed Neil H. McElroy.

→ The Soviet Union and Britain sign an agreement to expand cultural relations under which the Soviet jamming of BBC broadcasts allegedly will end.

→ Robert Murphy, Under Secretary of State about to retire, warns that instability or weakness in the West could lead to Soviet miscalculations that might produce war.

→ Britain and the United Arab Republic re-establish diplomatic relations.

→ It is revealed that the Pentagon opposes concessions which the State Department would like to make to Panama concerning the Canal Zone.

→ The United States steel industry considers its offer of a thirty-cents-an-hour increase as its "last offer."

Wednesday, December 2

→ President Eisenhower warns that the nation should be on its guard against a "hysterical urge" to spend great amounts of money on new weapons.

→ Eisenhower endorses the stand of Yale and Harvard University administrations against the non-Communist affidavit required for Federal student loans.

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev reveals in a speech in Budapest that some of his Politbureau associates opposed the use of Soviet troops in squashing the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

→ The Institute of Strategic Studies in London asserts that the Soviet Union has about one hundred principle missile bases and a missile service of 200,000 men.

→ President de Gaulle reassures Dr. Adenauer that his policies are not aimed at weakening NATO's military power.

→ *Izvestia* reveals in Moscow that Soviet writers receive twenty million dollars a year in outright Government subsidies above and beyond their generous royalty incomes.

→ Dr. Howard A. Wilcox, deputy director of research and engineering in the Defense Department, warns that the Soviet Union may be far ahead in chemical and biological weapons.

A Review Of The News

Thursday, December 3

→ President Eisenhower departs on his journey to three continents.

→ More than three hundred persons perish at a dam burst in Fréjus on the French Riviera.

→ The United States, Britain and other Western countries agree on a resolution to be passed by the United Nations on Hungary that is considerably "milder" than last year's.

→ Before leaving Washington President Eisenhower addresses a plea to the steel industry and the steel workers' union to avoid a new strike on January 26 when the Taft-Hartley injunction expires.

Friday, December 4

→ President Eisenhower lands in Rome where he is greeted by a relatively small crowd and by special welcome posters published by the Italian Communist Party.

→ According to diplomatic sources in Bonn, Germany, President de Gaulle considers a complete United States military withdrawal from Europe "as a probability rather than a possibility."

→ A Defense Department spokesman asserts "the existing base agreement does give Iceland the right to review the composition of our troops there."

→ Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, warns that the Soviet bloc is trying to dominate the entire free world under cover of the "peaceful coexistence" slogan.

Saturday, December 5

→ The Air Force will retire up to nine hundred aircraft to save money.

→ The United States decides to withdraw a thirteen-hundred-man Army combat team from Iceland, which will leave about four thousand United States soldiers in the country.

→ A Johns Hopkins University study, prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, opposes Khrushchev's plan for "total disarmament."

→ The seventh congress of the Hungarian Communist Party, attended by Khrushchev, ends with a call "to intensify the ideological campaign against opponents."

→ Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan reveals in Mexico City that Soviet trade with non-Communist countries in 1959 will exceed three billion dollars.

→ The *New York Times* correspondent calls Eisenhower's visit to Rome a "mixed success."

→ With an average production of 2,688,000 barrels a day, the Soviet Union regains its place as the world's second-ranking oil producer, ahead of Venezuela.

Sunday, December 6

→ Welcomed by a big crowd, Eisenhower arrives at Ankara, Turkey, after a short state visit at the Vatican.

→ The Democratic Advisory Council rejects Dean Acheson's critique of Eisenhower's foreign policy, calling it "too rigid."

→ Finland's Social Democratic Party accuses the country's Agrarian Govern-

A Review Of The News

ment of yielding Finland's independence to Soviet pressure.

→ In defiance of a Government ruling the West German sport organizations agree to competing at the Olympic games under a "neutral" banner that pleases Ulbricht.

→ French Premier Debré inaugurates the Sahara pipeline that makes France one of the leading oil-producing countries of the world.

Monday, December 7

→ Eisenhower lands in Karachi, Pakistan, to the welcome of a large crowd of spectators.

→ The United States approves a 22-million-dollar loan to Pakistan.

→ The Rockefeller Brothers Fund calls "for a candid recognition of the realities" of Communist China.

→ The British Parliament rejects a Labor Party motion to interfere with the South-African policy of race segregation.

Tuesday, December 8

→ President Eisenhower is reported to favor a reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government which would create an appointed office of Prime Minister.

→ The United States agrees to a Soviet demand that the Soviet bloc be given seven out of twenty-four seats in a permanent United Nations agency controlling outer space.

→ Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon commences a tour through European capitals to coordinate Western

economic aid to "underdeveloped countries."

→ The Communist-supported regional government of Sicily resigns.

→ Dr. Adenauer declares he will not participate at the "summit meeting," to avoid giving the Ulbricht regime an opportunity of claiming equality in international treatment.

→ Premier David Ben-Gurion accepts the commission to form his ninth Israeli Government.

Wednesday, December 9

→ On his arrival in New Delhi, India, President Eisenhower is greeted by huge crowds.

→ Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declares United States relations with Cuba have "deteriorated."

→ West German, Belgian, French and Italian commercial banks offer long-term credits to Communist Czechoslovakia to finance the country's Five-Year Plan.

→ The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development appoints a committee of "three wise bankers" (consisting of an American, a British, and a West German banker) to draw plans for Western investments in India and Pakistan.

→ James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force, is appointed Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Thursday, December 10

→ Eisenhower states to the Indian Parliament in New Delhi that the United States is "ready to defend its friends and

A Review Of The News

allies against aggression with armed force."

→ The United States and Japan have reached full agreement on the provisions of a new defense treaty that will be signed in Washington on January 20.

→ Cuba's foreign minister, Dr. Raul Roa, asserts his government is willing to discuss the amount of compensation for expropriated American-owned land in Cuba.

→ The West German Defense Ministry orders 564 Lockheed F-104 Starfighter jet planes, instead of the 200 budgeted a year ago, in addition to 120 million dollars' worth of United States Mace guided missiles.

Friday, December 11

→ Eisenhower appeals in New Delhi for a "world-wide war against hunger."

→ General Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the Paris NATO meeting, accuses Charles de Gaulle of endangering NATO's total military structure by withdrawing French cooperation.

→ NATO's military committee declares in Paris "we are going to hell in a hurry unless something is done soon."

→ The United States and the Soviet Union introduce a joint "outer space control" resolution in the United Nations.

Saturday, December 12

→ For the first time in the history of the United Nations a candidate opposed by the United States has been elected a member of the Security Council, as

Communist Poland, after a deadlock of several weeks, wins the seat over Turkey.

→ Denying the required two-thirds majority for the Afro-Asian resolution, the General Assembly of the United Nations avoids taking an anti-French position on Algeria, while the United States abstains, in spite of Eisenhower's promise at his last visit in Paris to vote for France.

→ The French Government complains that the publication of General Twining's warnings concerning a lack of French cooperation at NATO was a breach of guaranteed confidence.

→ A United States jet plane, F-105 Thunderchief, sets a new world speed record of 1216 miles an hour, flying at 36,000 feet.

→ United States Army training officers find that "six, eight, ten or twelve years in school does not necessarily mean that a man can read or write, add or subtract."

Sunday, December 13

→ Secretary of State Christian A. Herter warns the Parisian NATO meeting against "the grave error of planning for the future on an optimistic view of Soviet policies unwarranted by the facts of international life."

→ President Eisenhower lands in Teheran on a six-hour visit to Iran.

→ The United States Communist Party elects Gus Hall its Secretary General and adopts a "Declaration of Aims and Tasks" that forebodes increased "popular front" efforts.

A Review Of The News

→ David Ben-Gurion forms the new Israeli Government in which Abba Eban, former Israeli Ambassador to Washington, takes over part of the Foreign office agenda.

Monday, December 14

→ Eisenhower lands in Athens where he is welcomed by a large crowd and a wishful statement of the Greek Prime Minister that he hopes the President is coming as a Santa Claus.

→ All members of the Communist bloc sign an agreement for convertibility of their national currencies within the bloc.

→ Paul Henri Spaak, NATO's Secretary General, endorses General Twining's criticism of French "deviations" from NATO policy.

→ Archbishop Makarios is elected President of Cyprus by a two-to-one margin.

→ According to *Tass*, the Soviet Government accuses West Germany of seeking "to step up the arms race and to wipe out all limitations on its rearmament."

Tuesday, December 15

→ President Charles de Gaulle suggests that a formula should be sought for NATO that falls between full integration of forces and a mere coalition.

→ Secretary of State Christian A. Herter asks in Paris for a NATO alliance "loyal to the concept of military integration."

→ John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers, announces his resignation.

→ Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, predicts the Soviet Union will concentrate its major penetration efforts during the sixties on Asia — "from India to the tip of Indonesia"—, the Middle East, Africa and the Caribbean.

→ Major Hubert Matos, a non-Communist hero of the Castro revolution, is sentenced in Havana to twenty years imprisonment "for counterrevolutionary activities."

Wednesday, December 16

→ Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr. claims in Paris at the meeting of NATO's Ministerial Council that the United States has "present nuclear superiority" over the Soviet Union both in weapons and in the means of their delivery.

→ Eisenhower visits President Bourguiba of Tunisia for breakfast and issues a joint communiqué that expresses "grave concern" over Algeria.

→ Radio Free Europe announces in Munich, Germany, that a mass poisoning of its staff by atropine, attempted by Soviet agents, was prevented at the last minute.

→ According to a NATO analysis, the Soviet Union has about 20,000 operational aircraft based on 1,000 fields, and a fleet of 2,300 surface vessels and 600 submarines.

Thursday, December 17

→ On the eve of Eisenhower's arrival in Paris, NATO issues a statement that claims an ebbing of French "intransigence," but NATO secretary General Spaak is openly laughed at by the news

A Review Of The News

conference to which he delivers the communiqué.

→ Adlai E. Stevenson, titular leader of the Democratic Party, asserts he is "much encouraged by evidence from many quarters" that the Soviets seriously want disarmament.

→ A *New York Times* report from Havana reveals that the official leaders of Cuba's Communist Party participate in sessions of Fidel Castro's "super cabinet."

Friday, December 18

→ On his arrival in Paris Eisenhower receives an "almost perfunctory welcome."

→ Premier Chou En-lai of Communist China proposes to meet India's Prime Minister Nehru on December 26 to discuss the Chinese-Indian "border question."

→ The United States Army in Europe names a Czechoslovak consular official in Salzburg, Austria, as the organizer of the attempted mass poisoning in Munich.

Saturday, December 19

→ Eisenhower, de Gaulle, Macmillan and Adenauer agree in Paris to propose the "summit meeting" for April 27 in Paris.

→ Nuclear scientists in Geneva, representing the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union, reach a deadlock concerning the ban of nuclear tests.

→ Tunisian President Bourguiba discloses he told President Eisenhower "the time was not yet ripe" for peace

talks between Algerian rebels and the French Government.

→ Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of Lloyds Bank in London, Joseph M. Dodge, chairman of the Detroit Bank and Trust Company, and Dr. Hermann J. Abs, chairman of the Deutsche Bank in Frankfurt, will undertake to study investment problems in India and Pakistan.

Sunday, December 20

→ Eisenhower lands in Madrid where he is given a huge official welcome.

→ The Executive Committee of the Belgian labor unions announces a general strike for January 29 to demonstrate for guaranteed weekly pay rates.

→ Alfred Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach donates six million marks (15 million dollars) to compensate former Jewish concentration-camp inmates forced to work for his father's firm during the war.

Monday, December 21

→ Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary General of the United Nations, flies to the Near East to seek an "arrangement" between the United Arab Republic and Israel.

→ French Minister for Education, Bouloche, resigns because of disagreements with Charles de Gaulle concerning the state financing of parochial schools in France.

→ Communist-led Algerian rebel groups announce the formation of "a provisional Algerian government" opposed to the "Algerian Government-in-Exile" of Ferhat Abbas.

A Review Of The News

Tuesday, December 22

→ President Eisenhower returns to Washington from his four-continent journey.

→ Crown Prince Moulay Hassan of Morocco and Premier Abdallah Ibrahim ask France and Spain to withdraw their troops from Morocco by 1963.

→ Premier Abdul Karim el-Kassem accuses Iranian "imperialism" of inciting aggression against Iraq.

→ The Soviet Union and the United States agree to "exchange scientists" between the Soviet and the American expeditions in Antarctica.

Wednesday, December 23

→ It is announced that the United States and the Soviet Union will resume negotiations early in January about a settlement of Soviet lend-lease debts of World War II, Charles E. Bohlen representing the United States.

→ The French Senate approves by a vote of 427 to 71 the Government's bill providing state aid to Roman Catholic schools.

→ It is announced that the Pentagon and the State Department differ about United States policy on Panama, the President favoring "some kind" of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Thursday, December 24

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev sends letters to Eisenhower, Macmillan and Charles de Gaulle in which he accepts "the invitation to a summit meeting" but demands postponement to a May date.

→ Riots break out in French Martinique in the West Indies.

→ The Teheran radio attacks Iraqi Premier el-Kassem as a "Red servant of black imperialism."

→ Adenauer declares in a Christmas Eve speech that "we can unfortunately not say that conditions have grown any less serious."

Friday, December 25

→ Governor Nelson Rockefeller withdraws abruptly from competition for the 1960 Republican Presidential nomination.

→ A newly dedicated synagogue in Cologne, Germany, is desecrated by swastikas, but the German authorities immediately grab the assailants.

→ A savage tribal war rages in the heart of the Belgian Congo.

→ The Administration announces it will urge Congress not to cut Cuba's quota of the United States sugar market.

→ Radio Moscow accuses Dr. Adenauer's Christmas Eve speech of "fanning the spirit of Cold War."

→ The Western powers welcome Khrushchev's reply to their "invitation" and set a mid-May date for the "summit conference."

→ The Soviet Government orders tighter Party control for Soviet collective farms.

→ A scientific advisory committee of the Democratic party asks that "international disarmament be made a major national goal."

A Review Of The News

Sunday, December 27

→ The Soviet press indicates that Khrushchev will insist on making his "total disarmament" plan top agenda of the "summit meeting."

→ Financier Cyrus S. Eaton receives a congratulatory message from Khrushchev on his 76th birthday.

→ Iranian officials deny any serious aspects of the border dispute with Iraq.

Monday, December 28

→ May 16 is accepted by Khrushchev as date for the "summit meeting" in Paris.

→ Baudouin, King of the Belgians, finishes his journey through the Belgian Congo amidst loud cries for "independence."

→ The Italian Government forbids Austria's Under Secretary of State, Professor Gschnitzer, entry into Italy because of his speeches on Italian South Tyrol.

Tuesday, December 29

→ President Eisenhower declares the United States is free to resume nuclear tests on January 1, 1960.

→ French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville declares "France will take no action to cause the United States to withdraw troops from Europe."

→ After the new United States Ambassador to Bonn, Walter C. Dowling, conferred for more than an hour with Adenauer, diplomatic sources assert the Chancellor may soon travel to Washington.

→ Cuban military authorities claim to have smashed "two major plots against Prime Minister Fidel Castro."

Wednesday, December 30

→ The Moscow radio declares there is "not a single international problem of any moment" on which the Soviet Union and Communist China do not see "eye to eye."

→ America's scientific representative at the nuclear talks in Geneva, Dr. James R. Fisk, accuses the Soviet scientific delegation of "incorrect, distorted and misleading statements."

→ George F. Kennan declares he is unable to see any point in a "summit meeting."

→ *Pravda* accuses the United States of violating the fourteen-month moratorium on nuclear tests.

→ Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson warns that the nation's international balance of payments will show a deficit of four billion dollars in 1959.

Thursday, December 31

→ Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota announces his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for the presidency.

→ Vice President Richard Nixon and Secretary of Labor James Mitchell are engaged in "secret talks" with steel companies' officials.

→ Governor Clinton Clauson of Maine dies suddenly.

→ The U. S. Navy commissions its first nuclear-powered ballistic-missile-firing submarine, the U.S.S. George Washington.

In Print Again

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

by

Dr. J. B. Matthews

This article first appeared in the May, 1958 issue of AMERICAN OPINION. It had been reprinted twice since then. Two months ago, when our then current stock was exhausted, we began to notify those ordering the reprint that it was no longer available. The continuing demand has changed our minds. So a new supply has now been received from the printer, and we can again fill orders on *The World Health Organization*.

AMERICAN OPINION REPRINTS

<i>Article</i>	<i>1-99</i>	<i>100-999</i>	<i>1,000 or more</i>
The World Health Organization . . . by <i>J. B. Matthews</i>	10¢ each	8¢ each	7¢ each
The Federal Reserve System by <i>Hans Sennholz</i>	5¢ each	4½¢ each	4¢ each
A Letter To The South	10¢ each	8¢ each	7¢ each
The Scoreboard For 1959	10¢ each	4¢ each	3¢ each
Why People Become Communists	20¢ each	15¢ each	12¢ each
<i>Report of</i> American Bar Association <i>Special Committee On</i> <i>Communist Tactics, Strategy</i> <i>and Objectives</i>	20¢ each	15¢ each	12¢ each

AMERICAN OPINION, Belmont 78, Massachusetts

ORDER BLANK

You may order the books reviewed or advertised in **AMERICAN OPINION** from **THE BOOKMAILER**—the Complete Bookstore-by-Mail representing all United States publishers. You pay only the bookstore price. **THE BOOKMAILER** pays the postage, anywhere in the world.

(No. of copies)

<i>The Big Decision</i> , Cvetic	\$ 1.00
<i>Brainwashing In The High Schools</i> , Root	4.50
<i>The Case For Basic Education</i> , Koerner	4.00
<i>The Case For The South</i> , Workman	5.00
<i>Collectivism In The Churches</i> , Bundy	5.00
<i>The Famous Five</i> , Alexander	3.50
<i>For The Skeptic</i> , Munson	3.00
<i>The Freudian Ethic</i> , Richard LaPiere	5.00
<i>Gold Swindle</i> , Jordan	1.25
<i>The John Franklin Letters</i>	2.00
<i>Masters Of Deceit</i> , J. Edgar Hoover	5.00
<i>Nine Men Against America</i> , Gordon	3.00
<i>No Wonder We Are Losing</i> , Morris	2.50
<i>Peaceful Co-existence</i> , Kulski	12.50
<i>Retreat From Victory</i> , McCarthy	2.00
<i>The Right To Learn</i> , McCracken	4.50
<i>The Untold Story Of Panama</i> , Harding	6.00
<i>Up From Liberalism</i> , Buckley	3.50
<i>Walter Reuther</i> , Dayton	4.50
<i>Wedemeyer Reports</i> , Wedemeyer	6.00

Or any other book, published in the United States,
which you have seen reviewed or advertised.

Total number of books ordered Total price \$.....

THE BOOKMAILER,
Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, New York.

Please send the books checked above to:

Name _____

Street

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enclosed find \$.....

00
50
00
00
00
60
00
00
75
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0

00
50
00
00
00
60
00
00
75
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0